arXiv:1604.08298v2 [math.AP] 24 Aug 2016

Ground and bound state solutions for a Schrödinger system with linear and nonlinear couplings in $\mathbb{R}^N$

Kanishka Perera[a], Cyril Tintarev[b], Jun Wang[c], Zhitao Zhang[d*]

[a]Department of Mathematical Sciences, Florida Institute of Technology,

Melbourne, FL 32901, USA

[b]Department of Mathematics, Uppsala University,75 106 Uppsala, Sweden

[c]Faculty of Science, Jiangsu University, Zhenjiang, Jiangsu, 212013, P.R. China

[d]Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science, Chinese

Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, P.R. China

Abstract: We study the existence of ground and bound state solutions for a system of coupled Schrödinger equations with linear and nonlinear couplings in $\mathbb{R}^N$. By studying the limit system and using concentration compactness arguments, we prove the existence of ground and bound state solutions under suitable assumptions. Our results are new even for the limit system.

Keywords: Coupled Schrödinger systems; positive solutions; variational methods; linear and nonlinear couplings

AMS Subject Classification (2010): 35B32, 35B38, 35J50.

*Corresponding author. E-mail addresses: kperera@fit.edu (K. Perera), tintarev@math.uu.se (C. Tintarev), wangmath2011@126.com (J. Wang), zzt@math.ac.cn (Z. Zhang)

1 Introduction and main results

In this paper we study the 2-component coupled nonlinear Schrödinger system

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + u = (a_0(x) + a(x))|u|^{p-2}u + (\beta_0 + \beta(x))|u|^{\frac{p}{2}-2}u|v|^{\frac{p}{2}} + (\kappa_0 + \kappa(x))v, \\ -\Delta v + v = (b_0(x) + b(x))|v|^{p-2}v + (\beta_0 + \beta(x))|u|^{\frac{p}{2}}|v|^{\frac{p}{2}-2}v + (\kappa_0 + \kappa(x))u, \\ (u, v) \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N) \times H^1(\mathbb{R}^N), \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

where $2 < p < \frac{2N}{N-2}$ if $N \geq 3$, and $2 < p < \infty$ if $N = 1, 2$. We assume that the following condition holds:

(A_0) $a_0, b_0 \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ are positive $\mathbb{Z}^N$-periodic functions, $\beta_0, \kappa_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, $a, b, \beta, \kappa \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ go to zero as $|x| \to \infty$, and

$$\begin{aligned} &\inf_{x\in\mathbb{R}^N} (a_0(x) + a(x)) > 0, \quad \inf_{x\in\mathbb{R}^N} (b_0(x) + b(x)) > 0, \\ &0 < \kappa_0 + \inf_{x\in\mathbb{R}^N} \kappa(x) \leq \kappa_0 + \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^N} \kappa(x) < 1. \end{aligned} \tag{1.2}$$

This system of equations is related to the following important Schrödinger system with linear and nonlinear couplings arising in Bose-Einstein condensates (see [15]):

$$\begin{cases} -i\dfrac{\partial \Phi}{\partial t} = \Delta\Phi - V(x)\Phi + \mu_1|\Phi|^2\Phi + \beta|\Psi|^2\Phi + \kappa\Psi, \ t > 0, x \in \Omega, \\ -i\dfrac{\partial \Psi}{\partial t} = \Delta\Psi - V(x)\Psi + \mu_2|\Psi|^2\Psi + \beta|\Phi|^2\Psi + \kappa\Phi, \ t > 0, x \in \Omega, \end{cases} \tag{1.3}$$

where Ω is a smooth domain in $\mathbb{R}^N$, V is the relevant potential, typically consisting of a magnetic trap and/or an optical lattice, and Φ and Ψ are the (complex-valued) condensate wave functions. The intra- and interspecies interactions are characterized by the coefficients $\mu_1, \mu_2 > 0$ and β, respectively, while κ denotes the strength of the radio-frequency (or electric-field) coupling. This system also arises in the study of fiber optics, where the solution (Φ, Ψ) is two coupled electric-field envelopes of the same wavelength, but of different polarizations, and the linear coupling is generated either by a twist applied to the fiber in the case of two linear polarizations, or by an elliptic deformation of the fiber's core in the case of circular polarizations. Looking for solitary wave solutions of the form $\Phi(x, t) = e^{i\lambda t}u(x)$, $\Psi(x, t) = e^{i\lambda t}v(x)$, where $\lambda > 0$ is a constant, leads to the following elliptic system for u and v:

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + (\lambda + V(x))u = \mu_1 u^3 + \beta uv^2 + \kappa v & in \quad \Omega, \\ -\Delta v + (\lambda + V(x))v = \mu_2 v^3 + \beta u^2 v + \kappa u & in \quad \Omega, \\ u = v = 0 \ \text{ on } \ \partial\Omega \ (\text{or } u, v \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N) \text{ if } \Omega = \mathbb{R}^N), \end{cases} \tag{1.4}$$

which has received considerable attention in recent years.

Interesting existence and multiplicity results in various domains for system (1.4) with $\kappa = 0$ have been obtained in [1, 2, 4, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 18, 22, 23]. In particular, bifurcation results were obtained in [4], and larger systems and their limiting equations were considered in [11, 12, 13, 14]. It was shown in Ambrosetti-Colorado [1] that when $\kappa = 0$ and $V(x) \equiv 0$ there exist constants $\beta_2 > \beta_1 > 0$ such that this sytem has a positive ground state solution for $\beta > \beta_2$ and no positive ground state solution for $\beta < \beta_1$. A solution is called a ground state solution (or positive ground state solution) if its energy is minimal among all the nontrivial solutions (or all the positive solutions) of (1.1) or (1.4).

Existence and asymptotic behavior of multi-bump solitons of system (1.4) with $\kappa \neq 0, \beta = 0$ and $V(x) \equiv 0$ were studied in Ambrosetti-Cerami-Ruiz [2] using perturbation methods. Ambrosetti-Cerami-Ruiz [3] studied positive ground and bound state solutions of the system

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + u = (1 + a(x))|u|^{p-1}u + \kappa v, \\ -\Delta v + v = (1 + b(x))|v|^{p-1}v + \kappa u, \\ (u, v) \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N) \times H^1(\mathbb{R}^N) \end{cases} \tag{1.5}$$

when $\kappa > 0$, $N \geq 2, 1 < p < 2^* - 1$, where

$$2^* = \begin{cases} \frac{2N}{N-2}, \text{ if } N \geq 3, \\ +\infty, \text{ if } N = 2. \end{cases}$$

Under the general assumptions $a(x), b(x) \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$, $\lim\limits_{|x|\to+\infty} a(x) = \lim\limits_{|x|\to+\infty} b(x) = 0$, $\inf\limits_{x\in\mathbb{R}^N}(1 + a(x)) > 0$, $\inf\limits_{x\in\mathbb{R}^N}(1 + b(x)) > 0$, and additional suitable hypotheses, they used concentration compactness type arguments to obtain some interesting results about the existence of positive ground and bound state solutions.

System (1.4) with both $\kappa \neq 0$ and $\beta \neq 0$ has been much less studied. Topological methods were used in Beitia-Garca-Torres [5] to obtain a positive bound state solution, and variational methods and index theory were used in Li-Zhang [17] to obtain a ground state solution and infinitely many positive bound state solutions. Some existence results when $V(x) \equiv 0$ were obtained in Tian-Zhang [21] using variational and bifurcation arguments. In the present paper we consider the system (1.1), which generalizes (1.5), with $\kappa_0 \neq 0$ and $\beta_0 \neq 0$. Our results seem to be new even for the limit system (1.1) when $a(x) = b(x) = \beta(x) = \kappa(x) \equiv 0$.

Our first results is Theorem 1.1 below, which is concerned with the existence of a positive ground state solution of (1.1).

Theorem 1.1. *Suppose that* (A_0) *holds,* $0 < \kappa_0 < 1$, *and*

$$\kappa(x) \geq 0, \quad a(x) \geq 0, \quad b(x) \geq 0, \quad \beta(x) \geq 0, \tag{1.6}$$

with at least one of the inequalities in (1.6) *strict on a set of positive measure. Then* (1.1) *has a ground state solution. For the case* $u = v$, *if*

$$\kappa(x) \geq 0, \quad a(x) + b(x) + 2\beta(x) \geq 0, \tag{1.7}$$

with at least one of these inequalities strict on a set of positive measure, then (1.1) *has a ground state solution.*

Remark 1.2. We give conditions more general than (1.6) and (1.7) that guarantee the existence of a ground state solution of (1.1) (see Theorem 6.1 in Section 6), which are not stated here in order to simplify notation.

Next we study (1.1) when the functions a, b, κ and β are non-positive. In this case there exists no ground state solution (see Lemma 7.1), and bound states must be sought at higher levels. We assume that a_0 and b_0 are positive constants and $p = 4$ in (1.1). Then we have the following result.

Theorem 1.3. *Let* $a_0, b_0 > 0$, $0 < \kappa_0 < 1$, $p = 4$, *and assume that* (1.2) *and one of the following conditions holds:*

(1) $\beta_0 \geq 3$;

(2) $1 \leq \beta_0 \leq 3$ *and* $w(0) \leq \sqrt{\frac{2\kappa_0(1+\beta_0)}{(3-\beta_0)(1-\kappa_0)}}$, *where* w *is the unique positive solution of the scalar equation* $-\Delta u + u = u^3$, $u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$;

(3) $-1 < \beta_0 < 1$, $w(0) \leq \sqrt{\frac{2\kappa_0(1+\beta_0)}{(3-\beta_0)(1-\kappa_0)}}$, *and*

- *if* $N = 1$, *then* κ_0 *or* $\beta_0 - 1$ *is sufficiently small,*
- *if* $N = 2, 3$, *then* $\beta_0, \kappa_0 > 0$ *are sufficiently small, or* $|\beta_0|$ *is sufficiently small and* κ_0 *is close to 1.*

If $\kappa(x), a(x), b(x), \beta(x) \leq 0$, *with at least one of the inequalities strict on a set of positive measure, then system* (1.1) *has a positive bound state solution provided that*

$$R_0 := \left(1 + \frac{|\kappa|_\infty}{1-\kappa_0}\right)^2 \left(1 - \max\left\{\frac{|a|_\infty}{a_0}, \frac{|b|_\infty}{b_0}, \frac{|\beta|_\infty}{\beta_0}\right\}\right)^{-1} \tag{1.8}$$

is sufficiently small.

Remark 1.4. (1) We give a more precise assumption on R_0 (see Lemma 7.5), which is not stated here in order to simplify notation.

(2) A key step in the proof of Theorem 1.3 is showing the uniqueness and nondegeneracy of the positive solution of the limit system

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + u = a_0|u|^{p-2}u + \beta_0|u|^{\frac{p}{2}-2}u|v|^{\frac{p}{2}} + \kappa_0 v, \\ -\Delta v + v = b_0|v|^{p-2}v + \beta_0|u|^{\frac{p}{2}}|v|^{\frac{p}{2}-2}v + \kappa_0 u, \\ (u,v) \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N) \times H^1(\mathbb{R}^N). \end{cases} \tag{1.9}$$

Compared to the paper [3], we have more coupled terms here, namely $|u|^{\frac{p}{2}}|v|^{\frac{p}{2}-2}v$ and $|u|^{\frac{p}{2}-2}u|v|^{\frac{p}{2}}$. These terms present new difficulties for proving the uniqueness and nondegeneracy of the positive solution of (1.9) for general p. Using some ideas from [9, 24, 29], we prove this for the case $p = 4$ here (see Lemma 3.6). The proof for general p is an interesting open problem.

Remark 1.5. The main results are Theorems 1.1 and 1.3. For the limit system (3.1) used to prove the main results, Lemmas 3.1 – 3.6 are new and of independent interest.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we give some notations and preliminaries. In section 3, we study the existence and asymptotic behavior of the positive solution of the limit system (3.1), and consider the uniqueness and nondegeneracy of the positive solution of (3.1) when $p = 4$ and a_0, b_0 are positive constants. In section 4, we give a concentration compactness result. In section 5, we study existence of ground state solutions for a functional-analytic model of our problem. In section 6, we give several sufficient conditions for the existence of ground state solutions. In section 7, we prove the existence of bound state solutions of system (1.1) when $p = 4$ and a_0, b_0 are positive constants.

2 Preliminaries

We will use the following notations:

- for a positive function or constant M, $\|\cdot\|_M$ is the equivalent norm on $H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ defined by $\|u\|_M^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (|\nabla u|^2 + M|u|^2)$;
- $\|(u,v)\|_E = (\|u\|^2 + \|v\|^2)^{1/2}$ is the norm of $E = H^1(\mathbb{R}^N) \times H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$, where $\|\cdot\|$ is a norm on $H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$;

- for $1 \le p < \infty$, $|\cdot|_p$ is the usual norm of $L^p(\mathbb{R}^N)$ defined by $|u|_p = \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u|^p\right)^{1/p}$;
- 2^* is the critical Sobolev exponent given by $2^* = \frac{2N}{N-2}$ if $N \ge 3$, and $2^* = \infty$ if $N = 1, 2$;
- C_i, $i = 1, 2, \ldots$ denote positive constants.

The energy functional associated with the system (1.1) is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi(u,v) = \frac{1}{2}(\|u\|^2 + \|v\|^2) - \frac{1}{p}\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} [(a_0(x) + a(x))|u|^p + (b_0(x) + b(x))|v|^p] \\ - \frac{2}{p}\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (\beta_0 + \beta(x))|u|^{\frac{p}{2}}|v|^{\frac{p}{2}} - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (\kappa_0 + \kappa(x))uv, \ \forall (u,v) \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N) \times H^1(\mathbb{R}^N).\end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

To obtain nontrivial solutions of (1.1), we use the associated Nehari manifold

$$\mathscr{N} = \{z = (u,v) \in E \setminus \{(0,0)\} : \Phi'(u,v)(u,v) = 0\}. \tag{2.2}$$

Clearly, $\Phi \in C^2(E, \mathbb{R})$ and all nontrivial critical points of Φ are on $\mathscr{N}$. For $(u,v) \in \mathscr{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|u\|^2 + \|v\|^2 &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} [(a_0(x) + a(x))|u|^p + (b_0(x) + b(x))|v|^p] \\ &\quad + 2\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (\beta_0 + \beta(x))|u|^{\frac{p}{2}}|v|^{\frac{p}{2}} + 2\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (\kappa_0 + \kappa(x))uv \\ &\le C\left(\|u\|^p + \|v\|^p\right) + (\kappa_0 + \sup \kappa(x))(\|u\|^2 + \|v\|^2)\end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

by the Sobolev inequality. Since $\kappa_0 + \sup \kappa(x) < 1$ and $p > 2$, it follows from this that $\|u\| + \|v\| \ge \sigma > 0$ for all $(u,v) \in \mathscr{N}$, so $\mathscr{N}$ is uniformly bounded away from the origin in E.

Set

$$c = \inf_{(u,v)\in\mathscr{N}} \Phi(u,v).$$

A pair of functions $(u,v) \in \mathscr{N}$ such that $\Phi(u,v) = c$ will be called a ground state solution of (1.1). We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi|_{\mathscr{N}}(u,v) &= \left(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{p}\right)\left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}[(a_0(x)+a(x))|u|^p + (b_0(x)+b(x))|v|^p]\right. \\
&\quad \left. + 2\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}(\beta_0+\beta(x))|u|^{\frac{p}{2}}|v|^{\frac{p}{2}}\right] \\
&= \left(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{p}\right)\left[\|u\|^2+\|v\|^2 - 2\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}(\kappa_0+\kappa(x))uv\right] \qquad (2.4)\\
&\geq \left(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{p}\right)\left[\|u\|^2+\|v\|^2 - 2\left(\kappa_0+\sup\kappa(x)\right)\|u\|\|v\|\right] \\
&\geq \left(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{p}\right)\left[1-(\kappa_0+\sup\kappa(x))\right]\left[\|u\|^2+\|v\|^2\right].
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\kappa_0 + \sup\kappa(x) < 1$, it follows that $c > 0$. First we have the following lemma regarding the role of c.

Lemma 2.1. *If c is attained at $z \in \mathscr{N}$, then z is a solution of* (1.1).

Proof. Assume that $z_0 = (u_0, v_0) \in \mathscr{N}$ is such that $\Phi(u_0, v_0) = c$. According to [7, Theorem 4.1.1], $\mathscr{N}$ is a locally differentiable manifold and so there exists a Lagrange multiplier $\ell \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\Phi'(u_0,v_0) = \ell G'(u_0,v_0), \qquad (2.5)$$

where $G(u,v) = \Phi'(u,v)(u,v)$. We infer from $z_0 = (u_0,v_0) \in \mathscr{N}$ and $\kappa_0 + \sup\kappa(x) < 1$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
G'(u_0,v_0)(u_0,v_0) &= 2(\|u_0\|^2+\|v_0\|^2) - p\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}[(a_0(x)+a(x))|u_0|^p + (b_0(x)+b(x))|v_0|^p] \\
&\quad - 2p\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}(\beta_0+\beta(x))|u_0|^{\frac{p}{2}}|v_0|^{\frac{p}{2}} - 4\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}(\kappa_0+\kappa(x))u_0v_0 \\
&= (2-p)\left[(\|u_0\|^2+\|v_0\|^2) - 2\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}(\kappa_0+\kappa(x))u_0v_0\right] < 0.
\end{aligned} \qquad (2.6)$$

Testing the equation (2.5) with (u_0, v_0), it follows from (2.6) that $\ell = 0$. Thus, we have $\Phi'(u_0, v_0) = 0$, i.e., z_0 is a critical point of Φ. □

3 The limit equations

3.1 Ground state solution

In this subsection we study the existence and asymptotic behavior of the positive solution of the limit system

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + u = a_0(x)|u|^{p-2}u + \beta_0|u|^{\frac{p}{2}-2}u|v|^{\frac{p}{2}} + \kappa_0 v, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^N, \\ -\Delta v + v = b_0(x)|v|^{p-2}v + \beta_0|u|^{\frac{p}{2}}|v|^{\frac{p}{2}-2}v + \kappa_0 u, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^N, \end{cases} \tag{3.1}$$

where $2 < p < 2^*$, $a_0(x)$ and $b_0(x)$ are 1-periodic positive functions. The energy functional corresponding to (3.1) is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_0(u,v) = \frac{1}{2}(\|u\|^2 + \|v\|^2) - \frac{1}{p}\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} [a_0(x)|u|^p + b_0(x)|v|^p] \\ - \frac{2}{p}\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta_0|u|^{\frac{p}{2}}|v|^{\frac{p}{2}} - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \kappa_0 uv. \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

The corresponding Nehari manifold is

$$\mathscr{N}_0 = \{z = (u,v) \in E \setminus \{(0,0)\} : \Phi_0'(u,v)(u,v) = 0\}. \tag{3.3}$$

Clearly, $\Phi_0 \in C^2(E,\mathbb{R})$ and all nontrivial solutions are contained in $\mathscr{N}_0$. Set

$$c_0 = \inf_{(u,v)\in\mathscr{N}_0} \Phi_0(u,v). \tag{3.4}$$

As in (2.3)-(2.4), one can show that if $0 < \kappa_0 < 1$, $\mathscr{N}_0$ is uniformly bounded away from the origin $(0,0)$. Moreover, if we replace $\mathscr{N}$ and c by $\mathscr{N}_0$ and c_0, respectively, the conclusion of Lemma 2.1 remains true for $0 < \kappa_0 < 1$.

Now we are ready to prove the existence of a ground state solution of (3.1).

Lemma 3.1. *If $0 < \kappa_0 < 1$, the periodic system (3.1) has a positive ground state solution $(u,v) \in \mathscr{N}_0$.*

Proof. Let w_0 denote the positive solution of $-\Delta u + u = a_0(x)|u|^{p-2}u, u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$. Then $(w_0,0) \in \mathscr{N}_0$, and $\mathscr{N}_0 \neq \emptyset$. Let $\{(u_n,v_n)\} \subset \mathscr{N}_0$ be a minimizing sequences. By using the Ekeland's variational principle type arguments(see [20, Lemma 3.10] or [25]), we can assume that there exists a subsequence of $\{(u_n,v_n)\} \subset \mathscr{N}_0$(still denote by (u_n,v_n)) such that

$$\Phi_0(u_n,v_n) \to c_0, \quad \Phi_0'|_{\mathscr{N}_0}(u_n,v_n) \to 0. \tag{3.5}$$

Similar to (2.3) and (2.4), it follows from $\kappa_0+\sup\kappa(x)<1$ that $0<\sigma\le\|u_n\|+\|v_n\|\le C_1$. We claim that $\Phi_0'(u_n,v_n)\to 0$ as $n\to\infty$. Indeed, it is clear that

$$o(1)=\Phi_0|'_{\mathscr{N}_0}(u_n,v_n)=\Phi_0'(u_n,v_n)-\ell_n G_0'(u_n,v_n), \tag{3.6}$$

where $\ell_n\in\mathbb{R}$ and $G_0(u,v)=\Phi_0'(u,v)(u,v)$. As in Lemma 2.1, one can check that $G_0(u_n,v_n)(u_n,v_n)\le -C_2<0$. So, we know that $\ell_n\to 0$ in (3.6). Thus, it follows that

$$\Phi_0(u_n,v_n)\to c_0,\quad \Phi_0'(u_n,v_n)\to 0. \tag{3.7}$$

From the boundedness of $\{(u_n,v_n)\}$, without loss of generality we assume that $u_n\rightharpoonup u_0$, $v_n\rightharpoonup v_0$ in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$, $u_n\to u_0$ and $v_n\to v_0$ in $L^p_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, $\forall p\in(2,2^*)$.

We claim that $\{(u_n,v_n)\}$ is nonvanishing, i.e., there exists $R>0$ such that

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty}\int_{B_R(y_n)}(u_n^2+v_n^2)\ge\delta>0, \tag{3.8}$$

where $y_n\in\mathbb{R}^N$ and $B_R(y_n)=\{y\in\mathbb{R}^N:|y-y_n|\le R\}$. Arguing by contradiction, if (3.8) is not satisfied, then $\{(u_n,v_n)\}$ is vanishing, i.e.,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\sup_{y\in\mathbb{R}^N}\int_{B_r(y)}(u_n^2+v_n^2)=0,\ \text{for all } r>0. \tag{3.9}$$

According to Lions's concentration compactness lemma(see [25, Lemma 1.21]) that $u_n\to 0$ and $v_n\to 0$ in $L^t(\mathbb{R}^N)(\forall t\in(2,2^*))$. So, we infer from $\Phi_0'(u_n,v_n)(u_n,v_n)=0$ that

$$\begin{aligned}\|u_n\|^2+\|v_n\|^2=&\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}[a_0(x)|u_n|^p+b_0(x)|v_n|^p]\\&+2\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}\beta_0|u_n|^{\frac{p}{2}}|v_n|^{\frac{p}{2}}+2\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}\kappa_0u_nv_n\to 0,\end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

as $n\to\infty$. This contradicts with $\|u_n\|+\|v_n\|\ge\sigma>0$. Hence, (3.8) holds. Moreover, there exist $\{k_n\}\subset\mathbb{Z}^N$ and $R_0>R>0$ such that

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty}\int_{B_{R_0}(k_n)}(u_n^2+v_n^2)\ge\frac{\delta}{2}>0. \tag{3.11}$$

Set $\tilde{u}_n=u_n(x+k_n)$ and $\tilde{v}_n=v_n(x+k_n)$. Since $a_0(x)$ and $b_0(x)$ are 1-periodic functions, it follows that the norms and Φ are invariance under the translations $x\mapsto x+k_n$. Thus, we can assume that $\tilde{u}_n\rightharpoonup\tilde{u}_0$, $\tilde{v}_n\rightharpoonup\tilde{v}_0$ in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$, $\tilde{u}_n\to\tilde{u}_0$ and $\tilde{v}_n\to\tilde{v}_0$ in $L^t_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^N)(\forall t\in(2,2^*))$. Moreover, it follows from (3.11) that

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty}\int_{B_{R_0}(0)}(\tilde{u}_n^2+\tilde{v}_n^2)\ge\frac{\sigma}{2}>0. \tag{3.12}$$

So, we have $\tilde{u}_0 \neq 0$ or $\tilde{v}_0 \neq 0$. Furthermore, it follows from the weak continuous of Φ_0' and (3.7) that $\Phi_0'(\tilde{u}_0, \tilde{v}_0) = 0$ and $\tilde{z}_0 = (\tilde{u}_0, \tilde{v}_0) \in \mathscr{N}$. As in [17], we define the following inner product

$$\langle (u_1, v_1), (u_2, v_2) \rangle = \langle (u_1, v_1), (u_2, v_2) \rangle_1 - \kappa_0 \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (u_1 v_2 + u_2 v_1), \tag{3.13}$$

where $\langle (\cdot, \cdot), (\cdot, \cdot) \rangle_1$ denotes the inner product in E. Correspondingly, the induced norm denotes by $\|(\cdot, \cdot)\|_{\kappa_0}$. Furthermore, it follows from $0 < \kappa_0 < 1$ that the norms $\|(\cdot, \cdot)\|_{\kappa_0}$ and $\|(\cdot, \cdot)\|_E$ are equivalent in E. Hence, we infer from the weak lower semicontinuity of the norm that

$$\begin{aligned} c_0 \leq \Phi_0(\tilde{u}_0, \tilde{v}_0) &= \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p}\right) \left[\|\tilde{u}_0\|^2 + \|\tilde{v}_0\|^2 - 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \kappa_0 \tilde{u}_0 \tilde{v}_0 \right] \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p}\right) \|(\tilde{u}_0, \tilde{v}_0)\|_{\kappa_0}^2 \leq \liminf_{n \to \infty} \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p}\right) \|(\tilde{u}_n, \tilde{v}_n)\|_{\kappa_0}^2 \\ &= \liminf_{n \to \infty} \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p}\right) \left[\|\tilde{u}_n\|^2 + \|\tilde{v}_n\|^2 - 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \kappa_0 \tilde{u}_n \tilde{v}_n \right] \\ &= \liminf_{n \to \infty} \Phi_0(\tilde{u}_n, \tilde{v}_n) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \Phi_0(u_n, v_n) = c_0. \end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

So, $\tilde{z}_0 = (\tilde{u}_0, \tilde{v}_0) \neq (0, 0)$ is a ground state solution of (3.1). Finally, we prove that $\tilde{z}_0 = (\tilde{u}_0, \tilde{v}_0)$ is positive. Obviously, there exists unique $t > 0$ such that $t(|\tilde{u}_0|, |\tilde{v}_0|) \in \mathscr{N}_0$. So, one sees that

$$\begin{aligned} t^{p-2} &= \frac{\|\tilde{u}_0\|^2 + \|\tilde{v}_0\|^2 - 2\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \kappa_0 |\tilde{u}_0||\tilde{v}_0|}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left[a_0(x)|u|^p + b_0(x)|v|^p + 2\beta_0 |u|^{\frac{p}{2}} |v|^{\frac{p}{2}} \right]} \\ &\leq \frac{\|\tilde{u}_0\|^2 + \|\tilde{v}_0\|^2 - 2\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \kappa_0 \tilde{u}_0 \tilde{v}_0}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left[a_0(x)|u|^p + b_0(x)|v|^p + 2\beta_0 |u|^{\frac{p}{2}} |v|^{\frac{p}{2}} \right]} = 1. \end{aligned} \tag{3.15}$$

Furthermore, we infer from $t(|\tilde{u}_0|, |\tilde{v}_0|) \in \mathscr{N}_0$ that

$$c_0 \leq \Phi_0(t|\tilde{u}_0|, t|\tilde{v}_0|) = t^2 \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p}\right) \|(|\tilde{u}_0|, |\tilde{v}_0|)\|_{\kappa_0}^2 \leq \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p}\right) \|(\tilde{u}_0, \tilde{v}_0)\|_{\kappa_0}^2 = c_0. \tag{3.16}$$

Thus, one deduces that $t = 1$, $(|\tilde{u}_0|, |\tilde{v}_0|) \in \mathscr{N}_0$ and $\Phi(|\tilde{u}_0|, |\tilde{v}_0|) = c_0$. Hence, we can assume that $(\tilde{u}_0, \tilde{v}_0)$ is a nonnegative solution of (3.1). Moreover, by using the maximum principle we know that $(\tilde{u}_0, \tilde{v}_0)$ is a positive ground state solution of (3.1). □

Next we consider the asymptotic behavior of the ground state solution of (3.1) as the parameter $\kappa_0 \to 0$ in the simple case where $p = 4$, and a_0 and b_0 are constants. To emphasize the dependency on κ_0, in the following we write $c_0^{\kappa_0}$, $\mathscr{N}_0^{\kappa_0}$ and $\Phi_0^{\kappa_0}$ for c_0, $\mathscr{N}_0$ and Φ_0, respectively. We have the following result.

Proposition 3.2. *Let $a_0, b_0 > 0$, $\beta_0 > 0$, $0 < \kappa_0 < 1$, and let $(u_{\kappa_0}, v_{\kappa_0})$ be any positive ground state solution of* (3.1).

(1) If $N = 2$ or 3, then $(u_{\kappa_0}, v_{\kappa_0}) \to (u_0, v_0)$ in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ as $\kappa_0 \to 0$. Moreover, the following conclusions hold: (i) If $0 < \beta_0 < \min\{a_0, b_0\}$, or $\beta_0 > \max\{a_0, b_0\}$, or $0 < a_0 = b_0 < 1$ and $\beta_0 = a_0$, then (u_0, v_0) is a positive radial ground state solution of (3.1) *with $\kappa_0 = 0$. (ii) If $\min\{a_0, b_0\} \le \beta_0 \le \max\{a_0, b_0\}$ and $a_0 \ne b_0$, then one of u_0 and v_0 is zero, and (u_0, v_0) is a semipositive radial ground state solution of* (3.1) *with $\kappa_0 = 0$. (iii) If $a_0 = b_0 \ge 1$ and $\beta_0 = a_0$, then (u_0, v_0) is a nonnegative radial ground state solutions of* (3.1) *with $\kappa_0 = 0$.*

(2) If $N = 1$, then $(u_{\kappa_0}, v_{\kappa_0}) \rightharpoonup (u_0, v_0)$ in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ as $\kappa_0 \to 0$, and (u_0, v_0) has the same properties as above.

Proof. For $a_0, b_0 > 0$, we take $\kappa_0^n > 0$ such that $\kappa_0^n \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. Let $(u_n, v_n) := (u_{\kappa_0^n}, v_{\kappa_0^n})$ denote the positive ground state solution of (3.1) with $\kappa = \kappa_0^n$. We first claim that $c_0^{\kappa_0}$ is a decreasing function on κ_0. In fact, for $0 < \kappa_0^1 \le \kappa_0^2$, we let (u_1, v_1) and (u_2, v_2) denote the positive ground state solution corresponding to $\kappa_0 = \kappa_0^1$ and $\kappa_0 = \kappa_0^2$ respectively. Then there exists unique $t_1(\kappa_0^1) > 0$ such that $t_1(\kappa_0^1)(u_2, v_2) \in \mathscr{N}_0^{\kappa_0^1}$. As in (3.15) we know that $t_1(\kappa_0)$ is a decreasing function on κ_0. Hence, we infer from $(u_2, v_2) \in \mathscr{N}_0^{\kappa_0^2}$ that $\hat{t}_1 := t_1(\kappa_0^1) \le t_1(\kappa_0^2) = 1$, where $t_1(\kappa_0^2)$ satisfies $t_1(\kappa_0^2)(u_2, v_2) \in \mathscr{N}_0^{\kappa_0^2}$. So, it follows that

$$\Phi_0^{\kappa_0^1}(u_1, v_1) \le \Phi_0^{\kappa_0^1}(\hat{t}_1 u_2, \hat{t}_1 v_2) = \frac{\hat{t}_1^2}{6}\|(u_2, v_2)\|_{\kappa_0}^2 \le \frac{1}{6}\|(u_2, v_2)\|_{\kappa_0}^2 = \Phi_0^{\kappa_0^2}(u_2, v_2). \quad (3.17)$$

Thus, the claim holds. Hence, we know that

$$c_0^{\kappa_0^1} \le c_0^{\kappa_0^n} = \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p}\right)\|(u_n, v_n)\|_{\kappa_0^n}^2 \le c_0^{\kappa_0^{n+1}} \le \cdots \le c_0^0. \quad (3.18)$$

This implies that $\{(u_n, v_n)\}$ is bounded in E. In addition, since $\beta_0 > 0$ and $\kappa_0^n > 0$ close to zero, by the moving plane method (see [26, Theorem 2]), u_n and v_n must be radially symmetric and strictly decreasing functions.

We first consider the case $2 \le N \le 3$. Without loss of generality we assume that $(u_n, v_n) \rightharpoonup (u_0, v_0)$ in $E_r = H_r^1(\mathbb{R}^N) \times H_r^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$, and $(u_n, v_n) \to (u_0, v_0)$ in $L_r^p(\mathbb{R}^N) \times L_r^p(\mathbb{R}^N)(\forall p \in (2, 2^*))$. Moreover, $u_0, v_0 \ge 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^N$. For each $(\varphi, \phi) \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N) \times$

$C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$, one has that

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\Phi_0^{\kappa_0^n}\right)'(u_n,v_n)(\varphi,\phi) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N}[\nabla u_n\nabla\varphi + u_n\varphi + \nabla v_n\nabla\phi + v_n\phi - 3(a_0u_n^2\varphi + b_0v_n^2\phi)] \\ &\quad - \beta_0\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}(u_nv_n^2\varphi + v_nu_n^2\phi) + \kappa_0^n\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}(v_n\varphi + u_n\phi) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N}[\nabla u\nabla\varphi + u\varphi + \nabla v\nabla\phi + v\phi - 3(a_0u^2\varphi + b_0v^2\phi)] \\ &\quad - \beta_0\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}(uv^2\varphi + vu^2\phi).\end{aligned} \tag{3.19}$$

Thus, (u_0, v_0) satisfies (3.1) with $\kappa_0 = 0$. Moreover, as in (3.18) one infers that

$$c_0^{\kappa_0^n} = \Phi_0^{\kappa_0^n}(u_n, v_n) \to c_0^0 \quad \text{and} \quad \left(\Phi_0^{\kappa_0^n}\right)'(u_n, v_n) = 0. \tag{3.20}$$

As in Lemma 3.1, we infer that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}(u_n^4 + v_n^4) \geq \int_{B_R(y_n)}(u_n^4 + v_n^4) \geq \delta > 0$. Thus, from Brezis-Lieb lemma(see [25]) we infer that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}(u_n^4 + v_n^4) \to \int_{\mathbb{R}^N}(u_0^4 + v_0^4)$, and $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}(u_0^4 + v_0^4) \geq \delta > 0$. Hence, we know that at least one of u_0 and v_0 is not equal to zero. Moreover, we infer from (3.20) that (u_0, v_0) is a nonnegative ground state solution of (3.1) with $\kappa_0 = 0$. To make it clear we divide into the following cases:

(1) If $\beta_0 > \max\{a_0, b_0\}$, as in the proof of [27, Theorem 1], we know that (3.1) has positive radial ground state solution with $\kappa_0 = 0$. Moreover, $C_0^0 < \frac{S_1^2}{4}\max\{\frac{1}{a_0^2}, \frac{1}{b_0^2}\}$. Thus, $u_0 \not\equiv 0$ and $v_0 \not\equiv 0$ is a nonnegative radial ground state solution of (3.3) with $\kappa_0 = 0$. By maximum principal, one deduces that (u_0, v_0) is a positive radial ground state solution of (3.3) with $\kappa_0 = 0$.

(2) If $0 < \beta_0 < \min\{a_0, b_0\}$, by using similar arguments as in [27, Proposition 3.3], we know that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_n^4, \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} v_n^4 \geq \delta_0 > 0$. Hence, $u_0 \not\equiv 0$ and $v_0 \not\equiv 0$ is a positive radial ground state solution of (3.1) with $\kappa_0 = 0$.

(3) If $\min\{a_0, b_0\} \leq \beta_0 \leq \max\{a_0, b_0\}$ and $a_0 \neq b_0$, as in [27, Theorem 1], the system (3.1) does not have a nontrivial solution(both component are not equal to zero) with nonnegative components. So, one of u_0 and v_0 must be zero.

(4) If $0 < a_0 = b_0 < 1$ and $\beta_0 = a_0$, we claim that both u_0 and v_0 are non zero. In fact, if $u_0 = 0$, we infer from [27, Proposition 3.2] that

$$\frac{S_1^2}{4a_0^2} = c_0^0 \leq \frac{S_1^2}{4a_0}. \tag{3.21}$$

This is a contradiction. So, $u_0 \not\equiv 0$ and $v_0 \not\equiv 0$ is a positive radial ground state solution of (3.1) with $\kappa_0 = 0$ in this case.

Next we consider the case $N = 1$. As in (3.18), we obtain (u_n, v_n) is bounded in E_r. Without loss of generality we assume that $(u_n, v_n) \rightharpoonup (u_0, v_0)$ in $H_r^1(\mathbb{R}) \times H_r^1(\mathbb{R})$, and $(u_n, v_n) \to (u_0, v_0)$ in $L_{r,loc}^p(\mathbb{R}) \times L_{r,loc}^p(\mathbb{R})(\forall p \in (2, \infty))$. Moreover, similar to (3.19), one deduces that (u_0, v_0) is an nonnegative solution of (3.1) with $\kappa_0 = 0$. Since $C_0^{\kappa_0}$ is a decreasing function on κ_0, it follows from (2.4) that

$$\frac{1}{4}\int_{\mathbb{R}}(a_0u_0^4 + b_0v_0^4 + 2\beta_0u_0^2v_0^2) \geq c_0^0 \geq c_0^{\kappa_0^n} \geq c^{\kappa_0^1} \geq \delta > 0. \tag{3.22}$$

So, at least one of u_0 and v_0 is not equal to zero. The rest of the proof is almost the same as the case $2 \leq N \leq 3$. We omit the details here. □

3.2 Uniqueness and nondegeneracy of the positive solution

In this subsection we consider the uniqueness and nondegeneracy of the positive solution of (3.1) when $p = 4$, and a_0 and b_0 are positive constants. Then the system is

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + u = a_0u^3 + \beta_0v^2u + \kappa_0v, & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \\ -\Delta v + v = b_0v^3 + \beta_0u^2v + \kappa_0u, & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N. \end{cases} \tag{3.23}$$

We look for a synchronized solution of the form $z = (a_1w(a_3x), a_2w(a_3x))$, where w is the unique positive solution of

$$-\Delta u + u = u^3, \quad u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N). \tag{3.24}$$

Substituting z into (3.23) gives

$$\begin{cases} a_1a_3^2 = a_1 - \kappa_0a_2, \\ a_3^2 = a_0a_1^2 + \beta_0a_2^2, \\ a_2a_3^2 = a_2 - \kappa_0a_1, \\ a_3^2 = b_0a_2^2 + \beta_0a_1^2. \end{cases} \tag{3.25}$$

Solving (3.25) gives

$$\begin{cases} a_0 = b_0 := \mu > 0, \\ a_1 = a_2 = \pm\sqrt{\frac{1-\kappa_0}{\mu+\beta_0}}, \beta_0 > -\mu, 0 < \kappa_0 < 1, \\ a_3 = \sqrt{1-\kappa_0}, \end{cases} \tag{3.26}$$

or

$$\begin{cases} a_0 = b_0 := \mu > 0, \\ a_1 = -a_2 = \pm\sqrt{\frac{1-\kappa_0}{\mu+\beta_0}}, \beta_0 > -\mu, 0 < \kappa_0 < 1, \\ a_3 = \sqrt{1-\kappa_0}. \end{cases} \tag{3.27}$$

Without loss of generality we may assume that $a_0 = b_0 = \mu = 1$. Then the system (3.23) has the four synchronized solutions $z_{1,2} = \left(\pm\sqrt{\frac{1-\kappa_0}{1+\beta_0}}w(\sqrt{1-\kappa_0}x), \pm\sqrt{\frac{1-\kappa_0}{1+\beta_0}}w(\sqrt{1-\kappa_0}x)\right)$ and $z_{3,4} = \left(\pm\sqrt{\frac{1-\kappa_0}{1+\beta_0}}w(\sqrt{1-\kappa_0}x), \mp\sqrt{\frac{1-\kappa_0}{1+\beta_0}}w(\sqrt{1-\kappa_0}x)\right)$. We first consider the uniqueness of the positive solution z_1.

Lemma 3.3. *(1) If $N = 1$ and $\mu = 1$, then z_1 is the unique positive solution of (3.23) in the following cases: (i) $1 \le \beta_0$ and $0 < \kappa_0 < 1$, (ii) $-1 < \beta_0 < 1$ and $\kappa_0 > 0$ is sufficiently small, (iii) $0 < \kappa_0 < 1$ and $\beta_0 - 1 < 0$ is sufficiently small.*

(2) If $N = 2$ or 3, then z_1 is the unique positive solution of (3.23) in the following cases: (i) $\beta_0 \ge 1$ and $0 < \kappa_0 < 1$, (ii) $\beta_0, \kappa_0 > 0$ are sufficiently small, (iii) $\beta_0 > 0$ is sufficiently small and κ_0 is close to 1.

(3) If $\beta_0 < 0$ is sufficiently small, and $\kappa_0 = 0$ or κ_0 is close to 1, then z_1 is the unique radial positive solution of (3.23).

Proof. (1) We modify the argument of [24, Theorem 1.1]. If $N = 1$ and $\mu = 1$, system (1.1) reduces to

$$\begin{cases} -u'' + u = u^3 + \beta_0 v^2 u + \kappa_0 v, \quad \text{in } [0,\infty), \\ -v'' + v = v^3 + \beta_0 u^2 v + \kappa_0 u, \quad \text{in } [0,\infty), \\ u(r) > 0, v(r) > 0 \text{ in } [0,\infty), \\ u'(0) = v'(0) = 0,\ u(r),\ v(r) \to 0 \text{ as } r \to \infty. \end{cases} \tag{3.28}$$

Let (u, v) be a positive solution of (3.28). Thus, we only need to prove that $v(r) = u(r)$ for all $r \ge 0$ by the uniqueness result of the single scalar equation. Multiplying the first and second equations of (3.28) by v and u respectively, then we have that

$$(u'v)' - u'v' - uv + u^3 v + \beta_0 v^3 u + \kappa_0 v^2 = 0, \tag{3.29}$$

and

$$(uv')' - u'v' - uv + v^3 u + \beta_0 u^3 v + \kappa_0 u^2 = 0. \tag{3.30}$$

Subtracting (3.29) by (3.30) gives

$$(u'v - uv')' + (1-\beta_0)uv(u^2 - v^2) + \kappa_0(v^2 - u^2) = 0. \tag{3.31}$$

Integrating (3.31) over $(0,\infty)$ and using $u'(0) = v'(0) = u(\infty) = v(\infty)$, we have

$$\int_0^\infty [(1-\beta_0)uv - \kappa_0](u+v)(u-v) = 0. \tag{3.32}$$

We first claim that for $\beta_0 > -1$, $u \geq v$ or $u \leq v$. Suppose not, then $g = u - v$ changes sign. It is easy to see that

$$g'' - (1+\kappa_0)g - (u^2 + uv + v^2 - \beta uv)g = 0 \quad \text{in } [0,\infty). \tag{3.33}$$

By using unique continuation property for elliptic equation, we know that g is not equal to zero in any nonempty interval. Furthermore, by Maximum principle we infer that $g(r) = u(r) - v(r)$ changes sign only finite time. Without loss of generality we may assume that $g(r) > 0$ for large r. Thus there exists $R_1 > 0$ such that for $r > R_1$ and $\beta_0 \neq 1$

$$u(R_1)v(R_1) < \frac{\kappa_0}{|1-\beta_0|}, \quad u(R_1) - v(R_1) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad u(r) - v(r) > 0. \tag{3.34}$$

This implies that

$$u'(R_1) - v'(R_1) \geq 0. \tag{3.35}$$

Integrating (3.31) over (R_1,∞) we obtain

$$-(u'v - uv')(R_1) + \int_{R_1}^\infty [(1-\beta_0)uv - \kappa_0](u+v)(u-v) = 0. \tag{3.36}$$

We infer from (3.34)-(3.36) that

$$\begin{aligned} &-(u'v - uv')(R_1) = -u(R_1)[u'(R_1) - v'(R_1)] \leq 0 \quad \text{and} \\ &(1-\beta_0)u(r)v(r) - \kappa_0 \leq |1-\beta_0|u(R_1)v(R_1) - \kappa_0 < 0, \ \forall r \geq R_1. \end{aligned} \tag{3.37}$$

This contradicts with (3.36). If $\beta_0 = 1$, we can also find the contradiction by using the argument of (3.36)-(3.37). So, we prove the claim that for $\beta_0 > -1$, $u \geq v$ or $u \leq v$. Finally, we need prove that $u \equiv v$. We divide into the following three cases:

(*a*) If $\beta_0 \geq 1$, we know that

$$(1-\beta_0)u(r)v(r) - \kappa_0 < 0, \ \forall r > 0. \tag{3.38}$$

Moreover, we infer from $u \geq v$ or $u \leq v$ that the left hand of the integral is strict less than zero. This is contradiction. Thus, $u \equiv v$ in this case.

(*b*) For each $-1 < \beta_0 < 1$, without loss of generality we assume that $u \geq v$. It is clear that there exists $R_2 > 0$ large enough such that

$$\int_0^{R_2} (u(r)+v(r))(u(r)-v(r))dr > \int_{R_2}^{\infty} (u(r)+v(r))(u(r)-v(r))dr. \quad (3.39)$$

Furthermore, we can choose κ_0 small enough such that $[(1-\beta_0)u(R_2)v(R_2)-\kappa_0] > 0$. So, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^{\infty} [(1-\beta_0)uv-\kappa_0](u+v)(u-v) \\ \geq &[(1-\beta_0)u(R_2)v(R_2)-\kappa_0]\left(\int_0^{R_2}(u^2-v^2)dr - \int_{R_2}^{\infty}(u^2-v^2)dr\right) \quad (3.40) \\ >&0. \end{aligned}$$

This contradicts with (3.32).

(*c*) For each $0 < \kappa_0 < 1$, we should prove that the conclusion holds if $\beta - 1$ close to 0^+. Since $u(0) = \max u(x)$ and $v(0) = \max v(x)$, if $u(0)v(0) < \frac{\kappa_0}{1-\beta_0}$, we have that

$$\int_0^{\infty} [(1-\beta_0)uv-\kappa_0](u+v)(u-v) < 0. \quad (3.41)$$

This contradicts with (3.32).

(2) We first use the idea of [24] to consider the case (*i*). Let $\Gamma_+ = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N : u(x) - v(x) > 0\}$. Then Γ_+ is a piecewise C^1 smooth domain. Multiplying the first equation in (1.1) by v and the second equation in (1.1) by u and then integrating by parts on Γ_+ and subtracting together, we obtain the following integral identity

$$\int_{\partial\Gamma_+} (v\frac{\partial u}{\partial n} - u\frac{\partial v}{\partial n}) + \int_{\Gamma_+} [(1-\beta_0)uv-\kappa_0](u+v)(u-v) = 0, \quad (3.42)$$

where n denotes the unit outward normal to Γ_+. Since $u(x) - v(x) > 0$ in Γ_+, $u(x) - v(x) = 0$ on $\partial\Gamma_+$ and $\lim_{|x|\to\infty} u(x) = \lim_{|x|\to\infty} v(x) = 0$, it follows that

$$\int_{\partial\Gamma_+} (v\frac{\partial u}{\partial n} - u\frac{\partial v}{\partial n}) = \int_{\partial\Gamma_+} u\frac{\partial(u-v)}{\partial n} \leq 0. \quad (3.43)$$

On the other hand, one sees that for $\beta \geq 1$ and $0 < \kappa_0 < 1$

$$\int_{\Gamma_+} [(1-\beta_0)uv-\kappa_0](u+v)(u-v) < 0. \quad (3.44)$$

Hence, $\Gamma_+ = \emptyset$. Similarly, we may prove that the set $\Gamma_- = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N : u(x) - v(x) > 0\}$ is also an empty set. Therefore, $u = v$ and we complete the proof of the case (i).

Second, we consider the case (ii). According to [24, Theorem 4.1], if $\beta_0 > 0$ small and $\kappa_0 = 0$, we know that $z_1 = (\sqrt{\frac{1-\kappa_0}{1+\beta_0}}w(\sqrt{1-\kappa_0}x), \sqrt{\frac{1-\kappa_0}{1+\beta_0}}w(\sqrt{1-\kappa_0}x))$ is a unique positive solution of (1.1). Moreover, z_1 is nondegenerate in $E_r = H_r^1(\mathbb{R}^N) \times H_r^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ by [24, Lemma 2.2]. For each $z = (u, v) \in E_r$ we define

$$\Phi_{\kappa_0}(u, v) = \frac{1}{2}(\|u\|^2 + \|v\|^2) - \frac{1}{4}\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}(u^4 + v^4 + 2\beta_0 u^2 v^2) - \kappa_0 \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} uv. \quad (3.45)$$

Let $\Psi(\kappa_0, u, v) = \Phi'_{\kappa_0}(u, v)$. Obviously, we have that $\Psi(0, z_1) = 0$. Moreover, $\Psi_z(0, z_1) = \Phi''_{\kappa_0}(z_1)$ is invertible. By the implicit function theorem, there exist $\widetilde{\beta}_0 > 0, R_0 > 0$ and $\psi : (-\widetilde{\beta}_0, \widetilde{\beta}_0) \to B_{R_0}(z_1)$ such that for any $\beta_0 \in (-\widetilde{\beta}_0, \widetilde{\beta}_0)$, $\Psi(\kappa_0, z) = 0$ has a unique solution $z = \psi(\beta_0)$ in $B_{R_0}(z_1)$. Furthermore, by using the same blow up arguments as [9, Lemma 2.4], we know that for each fixed $0 < \kappa_0 < 1$, there exists $C_{\kappa_0} > 0$ such that

$$|u|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)} + |v|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)} \le C_{\kappa_0}, \quad (3.46)$$

where (u, v) is a nonnegative solution of (3.23). Thus for κ_0 sufficiently small, the set of solutions to system (3.23) is contained in $B_{R_0}(z_1)$.

Finally, we prove the case (iii). For $\bar{\beta}_0 > 0$, we define

$$\mathcal{S}_{\bar{\beta}_0} = \{z = (u, v) \in E_r : z \text{ is a positive solution of (3.23) with } \beta_0 \in [0, \bar{\beta}_0]\},$$

where $E_r = H_r^1(\mathbb{R}^N) \times H_r^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$. By using a minor modification of the arguments of [29, Corollary 2.4], we know that $\mathcal{S}_{\bar{\beta}_0}$ is compact in E_r. Moreover, according to [3, Lemma 3.13], we know that the unique positive solution $\tilde{z}_0 = (\sqrt{1-\kappa_0}w(\sqrt{1-\kappa_0}x), \sqrt{1-\kappa_0}w(\sqrt{1-\kappa_0}x))$ with $\beta_0 = 0$ of (3.23) is nondegenerate. So, by using the same arguments as in the proof of the case (i), we can prove that for $\beta_0 > 0$ small, (3.23) has a unique positive solution.

(3) Let $\mathcal{S}_{-\bar{\beta}_0} = \big\{z = (u, v) \in E_r : z \text{ is a positive solution of (3.23) with } \beta_0 \in [\bar{\beta}_0, 0]\big\}$. We first claim that for any $\bar{\beta}_0 > 0$, there exists $C_{\bar{\beta}_0} > 0$ such that

$$|u|_\infty + |v|_\infty \le C_{\bar{\beta}_0}.$$

Similarly, we also use the blow up arguments as [9, Lemma 2.4]. Assume that there exist a sequence of positive solutions $\{z_n = (u_n, v_n)\}$ of (3.23) with $\beta_n \in [-\bar{\beta}_0, 0]$ such that $\beta_n \to \tilde{\beta}$ and $|v_n|_\infty \le |u_n|_\infty \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$. We set

$$\eta_n = \frac{1}{|u_n|_\infty}, \quad (w_n(x), h_n(x)) = (\eta_n u_n(\sqrt{\eta_n}x), \eta_n v_n(\sqrt{\eta_n}x)).$$

Since u_n and v_n are radially symmetric and decreasing in the radial direction. Hence $|h_n|_\infty \le |w_n|_\infty = w_n(0) = 1$. It is easy to verify that (w_n, h_n) satisfies

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta w_n + \eta_n w_n = w_n^3 + \beta_n h_n^2 w_n + \eta_n \kappa_0 h_n, \\ -\Delta h_n + \eta_n h_n = h_n^3 + \beta_n w_n^2 h_n + \eta_n \kappa_0 w_n. \end{cases}$$

By the standard elliptic argument, we may assume that, subject to a subsequence, $(w_n, h_n) \to (w_0, h_0)$ in $C^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ as $n \to \infty$, where (w_0, h_0) is a nonnegative solution of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta w_0 = w_0^3 + \tilde{\beta} h_0^2 w_0, \\ -\Delta h_0 = h_0^3 + \tilde{\beta} w_0^2 h_0. \end{cases} \tag{3.47}$$

Since $w_0(0) = 1$ and the maximum principle shows that $w_0(x) > 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^N$. However, as in [28, Theorem 2.1], we know that for $\tilde{\beta} > -1$, any nonnegative solution of (3.47) is zero. This is a contradiction. □

By [24, Theorems 4.1 and 4.2], we have the following result for $\kappa_0 = 0$.

Lemma 3.4. *(1) If $N = 1$ and $0 \le \beta_0 \notin [\min\{a_0, b_0\}, \max\{a_0, b_0\}]$, then $z_0 = (\sqrt{\frac{\beta_0 - b_0}{\beta_0^2 - a_0 b_0}} w(x), \sqrt{\frac{\beta_0 - a_0}{\beta_0^2 - a_0 b_0}} w(x))$ is the unique solution of (3.23).*

(2) If $N = 2$ or 3, and $\beta_0 > \max\{a_0, b_0\}$ or $\beta_0 > 0$ is sufficiently small, then z_0 is the unique positive solution of (3.23).

Next we study the nondegeneracy of solutions of the system (3.23). Recall that (U_1, U_2) is a nondegenerate solution if the solution set of the linearized system

$$\begin{cases} \Delta\phi_1 - \phi_1 + \kappa_0\phi_2 + 3U_1^2\phi_1 + \beta_0 U_2^2\phi_1 + 2\beta_0 U_1 U_2 \phi_2 = 0, \\ \Delta\phi_2 - \phi_2 + \kappa_0\phi_1 + 3U_2^2\phi_2 + \beta_0 U_1^2\phi_2 + 2\beta_0 U_1 U_2 \phi_1 = 0, \\ \phi_1 = \phi_1(r), \ \phi_2 = \phi_2(r) \end{cases} \tag{3.48}$$

is N-dimensional, i.e.,

$$\phi = \begin{pmatrix} \phi_1 \\ \phi_2 \end{pmatrix} = \sum_{j=1}^{N} k_j \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial U_1}{\partial x_j} \\ \frac{\partial U_2}{\partial x_j} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{3.49}$$

Set $z_1 = (c_0 w_0, c_0 w_0) := (\sqrt{\frac{1-\kappa_0}{1+\beta_0}} w(\sqrt{1-\kappa_0}x),\ \sqrt{\frac{1-\kappa_0}{1+\beta_0}} w(\sqrt{1-\kappa_0}x))$. In the following we study the nondegeneracy of the solution z_1. First we have the following result for $\kappa_0 = 0$ as in [9, lemma 2.2].

Lemma 3.5. *If $0 \le \beta_0 \notin [\min\{a_0, b_0\}, \max\{a_0, b_0\}]$, then $\hat{z}_1 = (\sqrt{\frac{\beta_0 - b_0}{\beta_0^2 - a_0 b_0}} w(x),\ \sqrt{\frac{\beta_0 - a_0}{\beta_0^2 - a_0 b_0}} w(x))$ is nondegenerate in the space of radial functions.*

For $\kappa_0 \neq 0$, we have the following result.

Lemma 3.6. *Let $0 < \kappa_0 < 1$. If $\beta_0 \ge 3$, or $-1 < \beta_0 < 3$ and $w(0) \le \sqrt{\frac{2\kappa_0(1+\beta_0)}{(3-\beta_0)(1-\kappa_0)}}$, then $z_1 = (c_0 w_0, c_0 w_0) := (\sqrt{\frac{1-\kappa_0}{1+\beta_0}} w(\sqrt{1-\kappa_0}x),\ \sqrt{\frac{1-\kappa_0}{1+\beta_0}} w(\sqrt{1-\kappa_0}x))$ is nondegenerate in the space of radial functions, where $w(0) = \max w$ and w is the unique positive solution of the scalar equation.*

Proof. If $\kappa_0 \neq 0$, we shall prove the nondegenerate of $z_1 = (c_0 w_0, c_0 w_0) := (\sqrt{\frac{1-\kappa_0}{1+\beta_0}}$ $w(\sqrt{1-\kappa_0}x), \sqrt{\frac{1-\kappa_0}{1+\beta_0}} w(\sqrt{1-\kappa_0}x))$. The linearized problem of (3.23) at z_1 becomes

$$\begin{cases} \Delta\phi_1 - \phi_1 + \kappa_0\phi_2 + (3+\beta_0)c_0^2 w_0^2 \phi_1 + 2\beta_0 c_0^2 w_0^2 \phi_2 = 0, \\ \Delta\phi_2 - \phi_2 + \kappa_0\phi_1 + (3+\beta_0)c_0^2 w_0^2 \phi_2 + 2\beta_0 c_0^2 w_0^2 \phi_1 = 0, \\ \phi_1 = \phi_1(r),\ \phi_2 = \phi_2(r). \end{cases} \tag{3.50}$$

By an orthonormal transformation, (3.50) can be transformed to two single equations

$$\begin{cases} \Delta\Phi_1 - (1-\kappa_0)\Phi_1 + 3(1-\kappa_0) w^2(\sqrt{1-\kappa_0}x)\Phi_1 = 0, \\ \Delta\Phi_2 - (1-\kappa_0)\Phi_1 + \left[\frac{(3-\beta_0)(1-\kappa_0)}{1+\beta_0} w^2(\sqrt{1-\kappa_0}x) - 2\kappa_0\right]\Phi_2 = 0. \end{cases} \tag{3.51}$$

By scaling $x \mapsto \frac{y}{\sqrt{1-\kappa_0}}$, we know that (3.51) becomes

$$\begin{cases} \Delta\Psi_1 - \Psi_1 + 3w^2(y))\Psi_1 = 0, \\ \Delta\Psi_2 - \Psi_2 + \left[\frac{(3-\beta_0)}{1+\beta_0} w^2(y) - \frac{2\kappa_0}{1-\kappa_0}\right]\Psi_2 = 0, \end{cases} \tag{3.52}$$

where $\Psi_i(y) = \Phi_i(\frac{y}{\sqrt{1-\kappa_0}})(i = 1, 2)$. On the other hand, since the eigenvalues of

$$\Delta\Psi - \Psi + \lambda w^2 \Psi = 0, \quad \Psi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N) \tag{3.53}$$

are

$$\lambda_1 = 1,\ \lambda_2 = \cdots = \lambda_{N+1} = 3,\ \lambda_{N+2} > 3, \tag{3.54}$$

where the eigenfunction corresponding to λ_1 is cw, and the eigenfunctions corresponding to λ_2 are spanned by $\frac{\partial w}{\partial x_j}(j = 1, 2, \cdots, N)$.

So, the first equation (3.52) has only zero solution, i.e., $\Psi_1 = 0$.

If $\beta_0 \geq 3$ and $0 < \kappa_0 < 1$ we know that $K(\beta_0, \kappa_0) := \frac{(3-\beta_0)}{1+\beta_0} w^2(y) - \frac{2\kappa_0}{1-\kappa_0} < 0$. It follows that $\Psi_2 = 0$.

If $-1 < \beta_0 < 3$, $0 < \kappa_0 < 1$ and $w(0) \leq \sqrt{\frac{2\kappa_0(1+\beta_0)}{(3-\beta_0)(1-\kappa_0)}}$, then $K(\beta_0, \kappa_0) \leq 0$. Thus, $\Psi_2 = 0$. □

Remark 3.7. Similarly, under the same conditions of Lemma 3.6, one can prove that $z_2 = (-c_0 w_0, -c_0 w_0) = (-\sqrt{\frac{1-\kappa_0}{1+\beta_0}} w(\sqrt{1-\kappa_0}x), -\sqrt{\frac{1-\kappa_0}{1+\beta_0}} w(\sqrt{1-\kappa_0}x))$ is also nondegenerate in the space of radial functions.

4 Concentration compactness lemma

The following profile decomposition is an immediate consequence of Theorem 3.1, that trivially adapts the reasoning for the scalar case of Corollary 3.2, from [19] to the Hilbert space $E = H^1(\mathbb{R}^N) \times H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$, equipped with the group D of lattice translations $D = \{(u, v) \mapsto (u(\cdot - y), v(\cdot - y)),\ y \in \mathbb{Z}^N\}$.

Theorem 4.1. *Let (u_k, v_k) be a bounded sequence in E. There exists a renamed subsequence and a sequence $(y_k^{(n)})_k \subset \mathbb{Z}^N)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $y_k^{(1)} = 0$,*

$$U^{(n)} = \overrightarrow{\lim}\, u_k(\cdot + y_k^{(n)});\ V^{(n)} = \overrightarrow{\lim}\, v_k(\cdot + y_k^{(n)}); \tag{4.1}$$

$$|y_k^{(m)} - y_k^{(n)}| \to \infty \text{ for } m \neq n, \tag{4.2}$$

$$\sum_n \|U^{(n)}\|^2 \leq \|u_k\|^2 + o(1);\ \sum_n \|V^{(n)}\|^2 \leq \|v_k\|^2 + o(1); \tag{4.3}$$

and for any $p \in (2, 2^*)$,

$$\rho_k := u_k - \sum_n U^{(n)}(\cdot - y_k^{(n)}) \to 0 \text{ in } L^p;\ \tau_k := v_k - \sum_n V^{(n)}(\cdot - y_k^{(n)}) \to 0 \text{ in } L^p; \tag{4.4}$$

and the series in the last relations are convergent unconditionally in H^1 and uniformly with respect to k.

Note that it is a priori possible that one of the components of $(U^{(n)}, V^{(n)})$ is zero.

We will now evaluate the asymptotic value of the functional (2.1) on a sequence provided by the theorem above.

Proposition 4.2. *Let Φ be the functional* (2.1) *and let Φ_0 be the functional* (3.2). *Let (u_k, v_k) be the sequence provided by Theorem 4.1. Then*

$$\Phi(u_k, v_k) \geq \Phi(U^{(1)}, V^{(1)}) + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \Phi_0(U^{(n)}, V^{(n)}). \tag{4.5}$$

Moreover, if, in addition, $\Phi'(u_k, v_k) \to 0$ and $\Phi(u_k, v_k) \to c \in \mathbb{R}$, then $(U^{(1)}, V^{(1)})$ is a critical point of the functional Φ, $(U^{(n)}, V^{(n)})$ for any $n \geq 2$ is a critical point of the functional Φ_0, and

$$\Phi(U^{(1)}, V^{(1)}) + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \Phi_0(U^{(n)}, V^{(n)}) = c. \tag{4.6}$$

Proof. By continuity of $\Phi - \Phi_0$ with respect to the weak convergence it suffices to prove (4.5) for $\Phi = \Phi_0$, which can be immediately obtained by iteration of the Brezis-Lieb lemma (see [8], Appendix B, for the scalar case). Since the map $\Phi' - \Phi_0'$ is continuous with respect to the weak convergence, the conclusion that $(U^{(n)}, V^{(n)})$ is a critical point for respective functional is immediate. In order to show (4.6), let ρ_k and τ_k be as in (4.4) and note that $\Phi'(u, v) = (u, v) + \varphi'(u, v)$ with continuous $\varphi'(u, v) : L^p \times L^p \to E$. From here and from the criticality of points $(U^{(n)}, V^{(n)})$ it follows from $(u_k, v_k) + \varphi'(u_k, v_k) = \Phi'(u_k, v_k) \to 0$ by a standard continuity argument that $(\rho_k, \tau_k) \to 0$ in E. Consequently, recalling again that $\Phi - \Phi_0$ is weakly continuous, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
c &= \lim \Phi(u_k, v_k) \\
&= \lim \Phi(\sum_n U^{(n)}(\cdot - y_k^{(n)}), \sum_n V^{(n)}(\cdot - y_k^{(n)})) \\
&= \lim \Phi_0(\sum_n U^{(n)}(\cdot - y_k^{(n)}), \sum_n V^{(n)}(\cdot - y_k^{(n)})) + (\Phi - \Phi_0)(U^{(1)}, V^{(1)}) \\
&= \sum \Phi_0(U^{(n)}, V^{(n)}) + (\Phi - \Phi_0)(U^{(1)}, V^{(1)}),
\end{aligned}$$

which proves (4.6). □

5 Ground state solutions - functional-analytic setting

In this section we study existence of ground state solutions for a functional-analytic model of our problem. We identify, for a class of functionals defined below, the ground state with the mountain pass solution. We then formulate a sufficient condition for existence of a ground state in terms of comparison with the problem at infinity (which, in these general settings, is not required itself to admit a ground state). Verification of the comparison condition and existence of the ground state for the problem at infinity is a subject of the next section, where more specific properties of the functional are invoked. The number $p > 2$ remains fixed throughout the section.

Definition 5.1. Let H be a Hilbert space. We say that a functional $\Phi \in C^2(H)$ is of class $\mathcal{S}_p$, if it is of the form $\Phi(u) = \frac{1}{2}\|u\|^2 - \frac{1}{p}\psi(u)$, where the functional $\psi \in C^2(H)$ is bounded on bounded sets, homogeneous of degree p and positive except at $u = 0$, the norm refers to any of equivalent norms of H, and assume that Φ' is weak-to-weak continuous on H. It is to be understood that the norm $\|\cdot\|$ is not fixed, but is one of equivalent norms of H, that may vary for different functionals in the class.

Note that the functional (2.1), and consequently (3.2), are of the class $\mathcal{S}_p$.

Lemma 5.2. *Let $\Phi \in \mathcal{S}_p$ and let $\mathcal{N} = \{u \in H\setminus\{0\} : (\Phi'(u), u) = 0\}$. Then $w \in H\setminus\{0\}$ minimizes Φ on $\mathcal{N}$ if and only if the path $t \mapsto tw$, $0 \le t < \infty$ minimizes*

$$c = \inf_{\eta\in P}\max_{t>0}\Phi(\eta(t)), \tag{5.1}$$

where

$$P = \{\eta \in C([0,\infty); H), \eta(0) = 0, \Phi(\eta(+\infty)) = -\infty\}. \tag{5.2}$$

Moreover, w is a critical point of Φ.

Proof. 1. First note that Φ has the classical mountain pass geometry. Note also that since ψ is bounded on bounded sets and homogeneous, $0 \le \psi(u) \le C\|u\|^p$ which implies that $\mathcal{N}$ is bounded away from the origin. Furthermore, by Euler theorem for homogeneous functions, $(\psi''(u)u, u) = p(p-1)\psi(u) > 0$ unless $u = 0$, and therefore a minimizer w of Φ on $\mathcal{N}$ is a nonzero critical point of Φ.

2. Note that every path in P intersects $\mathcal{N}$, which implies that $c \ge \Phi(w)$. On the other hand, $c \le \max_t \Phi(tw) = \Phi(w)$. It is immediate then that whenever w is a minimizer of Φ on $\mathcal{N}$, the path $t \mapsto tw$ minimizes (5.1).

3. Conversely, if $w \in H \setminus \{0\}$ is such that the path $t \mapsto tw$ minimizes (5.1), then the maximum of Φ on the path is necessarily a critical point of Φ, and thus belongs to $\mathcal{N}$, and consequently is attained at $t = 1$, so w is a critical point of Φ. If, however, w is not a minimal point of Φ on $\mathcal{N}$, and w_1 is such a minimizer, the maximum of Φ on tw_1 will be smaller than c, a contradiction. □

Lemma 5.3. *Let $\Phi \in \mathcal{S}_p$. Let c be the minimax value* (5.1)*. Then, if $\Phi(w_k) \to c$ and $\Phi'(w_k) \to 0$ in H, then w_k is bounded. Moreover, if $w_k \rightharpoonup w \neq 0$, then $w_k \to w$ in the norm of H and w is a ground state of Φ.*

Proof. The proof of the first assertion of the lemma follows the classical argument of Ambrosetti-Rabinowitz. Multiplication of $\Phi'(w_k) \to 0$ by $w_k/\|w_k\|$ (the case when $w_k = 0$ on a subsequence is trivial) gives

$$\|w_k\| - \frac{\psi(w_k)}{\|w_k\|} \to 0.$$

This implies that $\psi(w_k) = \|w_k\|(\|w_k\| + o(1))$ and $\Phi(w_k) = (\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p})\|w_k\|^2 + o(\|w_k\|) \to c$, which implies that w_k is bounded in norm. Then we also have $\Phi(w_k) = (\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p})\|w_k\|^2 + o(1)$.

We now prove the second assertion when $w_k \rightharpoonup w \neq 0$. By weak semicontinuity of the norm,

$$\Phi(w_k) = (\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p})\|w_k\|^2 + o(1) \geq (\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p})\|w\|^2 + o(1) = \Phi(w) + o(1).$$

By weak-to-weak continuity of Φ', the element w is a (nonzero) critical point of Φ, and thus $w \in \mathcal{N}$. Evaluation of the functional on the path $t \mapsto tw$ gives $\lim \Phi(w_k) = c \leq \Phi(w)$. Together with the previous inequality we have that $\Phi(w_k) \to \Phi(w)$. This implies that $\|w_k\|^2 \to \|w\|^2$, which in turn means that $w_k \to w$ in H. By Lemma 5.2, the element w is a ground state of Φ. □

Lemma 5.3 shows that the ground state exists as long as the critical sequence at the mountain pass level does not converge weakly to zero. The next lemma introduces a (still implicit) sufficient condition for the latter and thus for the existence of a ground state.

From now on we assume that H is a space of functions $\mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}^m$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, such that for every sequence $y_k \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $|y_k| \to \infty$ and every $w \in H$, $w(\cdot - y_k) \rightharpoonup 0$.

Definition 5.4. Let $\Phi \in \mathcal{S}_p$. One says that a functional $\Phi_0 \in \mathcal{S}_p$ is a limit of Φ at infinity if for every $y \in \mathbb{Z}^N$ and every $w \in H$, $\Phi_0(w(\cdot + y)) = \Phi_0(w)$, and the maps $\Phi - \Phi_0$ and $\Phi' - \Phi_0'$ are continuous with respect to weak convergence.

Note that $c \leq c_0$, which is easy to show by evaluating Φ on the paths approximating c_0 for Φ_0, translated by y far enough from the origin of $\mathbb{Z}^N$ (on which the difference between Φ_0 and Φ is insignificant).

In what follows we will make the following assumption on the functional ψ_0:

$$w_k \in H, y_k \in \mathbb{Z}^N, w_k(\cdot - y_k) \rightharpoonup 0 \Longrightarrow \psi_0(w_k) \to 0. \tag{5.3}$$

Note that our notation is consistent with the notation in the previous sections in the sense that whenever $0 < \kappa_0 < 1$, the functional (3.2) is the limit at infinity of the functional (2.1).

Lemma 5.5. *Assume that $\Phi \in \mathcal{S}_p$ has a limit functional $\Phi_0 \in \mathcal{S}_p$ at infinity and that* (5.3) *is satisfied. Let c and c_0 be the mountain pass values* (5.1) *for Φ and Φ_0, respectively. If $c < c_0$, then Φ has a ground state.*

Proof. Let $w_k \rightharpoonup 0$ be a critical sequence for Φ with $\Phi(w_k) \to c$. By definition of the functional at infinity, we have $c = \lim \Phi(w_k) = \lim \Phi_0(w_k) = \lim \Phi_0(w_k(\cdot - y_k))$ for any sequence $y_k \in \mathbb{Z}^N$ such that $|y_k| \to \infty$. Note also that we may assume that $w_k(\cdot - y_k)$ has a weak limit w_0, which is necessarily a critical point of Φ_0. We may also assume that $w_0 \neq 0$, since if it would happen for any sequence y_k with $|y_k| \to \infty$, by (5.3) we would have $\Phi_0(w_k) \to 0$, and thus $c = \lim \Phi(w_k) = 0$, a contradiction. Then, by weak-to-weak continuity of Φ_0' (assured by the definition of $\mathcal{S}_p$) we have $w_0 \in \mathcal{N}_0$, and therefore $\Phi_0(w_0) \geq c_0$.

Since $\Phi_0(w_k(\cdot - y_k)) = (\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p})\|w_k\|_0^2 + o(1)$ and the norm is weakly lower semicontinuous, we have

$$c + o(1) = \Phi_0(w_k(\cdot - y_k)) \geq (\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p})\|w_0\|_0^2 = \Phi_0(w_0) \geq c_0,$$

which contradicts the assumption $c < c_0$. We conclude that the critical sequence has to have a subsequence with a nonzero weak limit, which by Lemma 5.3 implies existence of a ground state. □

Lemma 5.6. *Assume that $\Phi \in \mathcal{S}_p$ has a limit functional $\Phi_0 \in \mathcal{S}_p$ at infinity. Let c and c_0 be the mountain pass values* (5.1) *for Φ and Φ_0, respectively. Assume that Φ_0 has a*

ground state w_0. If

$$(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{p})\left(\frac{\|w_0\|^p}{\psi(w_0)}\right)^{\frac{2}{p-2}} < \Phi_0(w_0), \tag{5.4}$$

then $c < c_0$.

Proof. By defintion,

$$c \le \max_{t>0} \Phi(tw_0) = \max_{t>0} \frac{t^2}{2}\|w_0\|^2 - \frac{t^p}{p}\psi(w_0).$$

Elementary evaluation of the maximum gives

$$c \le (\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{p})\left(\frac{\|w_0\|^p}{\psi(w_0)}\right)^{\frac{2}{p-2}}.$$

Since $c_0 = \Phi_0(w_0)$, the inequality above and (5.4) imply $c < c_0$. □

Corollary 5.7. *Under conditions of Lemma 5.6, if*

$$\frac{\|w_0\|^p}{\psi(w_0)} < \frac{\|w_0\|_0^p}{\psi_0(w_0)}, \tag{5.5}$$

then $c < c_0$.

Proof. Since $\Phi_0 \in \mathcal{S}_p$, we have the representation $\Phi_0 = \frac{1}{2}\|\cdot\|_0^2 - \frac{1}{p}\psi_0$ which, by repeating calculations in the proof of Lemma 5.6 allows to represent the ground state value of Φ_0 as

$$c_0 = \max_t \Phi_0(tw_0) = (\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{p})\left(\frac{\|w_0\|_0^p}{\psi_0(w_0)}\right)^{\frac{2}{p-2}}.$$

Thus (5.4) can be written in the equivalent form as (5.5). □

6 Ground state solutions

Now we give several sufficient conditions to have (5.5). We will always assume that $0 < \kappa_0 < 1$, so that the functional Ψ_0 has a positive ground state, which we denote as (u, v), by Lemma 3.1.

Theorem 6.1. *The functional* (2.1) *has a ground state if one of the following conditions* (6.1)-(6.4) *holds.*

$$\left(\frac{\|(u,v)\|_0^2 - \int \kappa(x)uv}{\|z\|_0^2}\right)^{p/2} < \frac{\psi(u,v)}{\psi_0(u,v)}; \tag{6.1}$$

$$\kappa(x) \geq 0, a(x) \geq 0, b(x) \geq 0, \beta(x) \geq 0, \tag{6.2}$$

provided that at least one of the inequalities is strict on a set of positive measure;

For the case $u = v$ (see sufficient conditions in Section 3),

$$(a(x) + b(x) + 2\beta(x))u^{p-2} + p\kappa(x) \geq 0; \tag{6.3}$$

or in particular if

$$\kappa(x) \geq 0 \text{ and } a(x) + b(x) + 2\beta(x) \geq 0, \tag{6.4}$$

provided that at least one of the inequalities is strict on a set of positive measure.

Proof. Condition (6.1) is a restatement of (5.5). Condition (6.2) obviously implies (6.1). Condition (6.3) is (6.1) restated for $u = v = w$, and condition (6.4) trivially implies (6.3). □

Proof of Theorem 1.1. From the results of Theorem 6.1, we know that Theorem 1.1 hold. □

Finally we give another proof for Lemma 3.1.

Proof of Lemma 3.1. Let w_k be the subsequence given by Theorem 4.1 of a critical sequence for Φ_0. Assume that the series (4.4) contains at least two nonzero terms. Then, using Proposition 4.2 we have

$$\begin{aligned} c_0 &= \Phi_0(w_k) + o(1) = (\tfrac{1}{2} - \tfrac{1}{p})\psi_0(w_k) + o(1) \\ &\geq (\tfrac{1}{2} - \tfrac{1}{p})(\psi_0(U^{(1)}, V^{(1)}) + \psi_0(U^{(2)}, V^{(2)})) + o(1) \\ &= \Phi_0(U^{(1)}, V^{(1)}) + \Phi_0(U^{(2)}, V^{(2)}) + o(1). \end{aligned} \tag{6.5}$$

At the same time, considering the functional Φ_0 on the path $t \mapsto t(U^{(1)}, V^{(1)})$, we have $c_0 \leq \Phi_0(U^{(1)}, V^{(1)})$, which is a contradiction. We conclude therefore that the critical sequence $\tilde{w}_k = w_k(\cdot + y_k^{(1)})$ is convergent in L^p to $(U^{(1)}, V^{(1)})$, from which one can easily conclude that $(U^{(1)}, V^{(1)})$ is a ground state. □

7 Bound state solutions

Throughout this section we fix $0 < \kappa_0 < 1$, and assume that $\kappa(x) \leq 0$, $a(x) \leq 0$, $b(x) \leq 0$ and $\beta(x) \leq 0$, with at least one of the inequalities strict on a set of positive measure.

Lemma 7.1. *$c = c_0$ and c is not attained.*

Proof. The periodic system (3.1) has a positive ground state solution $(u, v) \in \mathscr{N}_0$ by Lemma 3.1. Take a sequence $y_k \in \mathbb{Z}^N$ such that $|y_k| \to \infty$ and set

$$(u_k, v_k) = (t_k\, u(\cdot + y_k), t_k\, v(\cdot + y_k)),$$

where $t_k > 0$ is such that $(u_k, v_k) \in \mathscr{N}$, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} t_k^{p-2} &= \frac{\|u(\cdot + y_k)\|^2 + \|v(\cdot + y_k)\|^2 - 2\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (\kappa_0 + \kappa(x))\, u(x + y_k)\, v(x + y_k)\, dx}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \big[(a_0(x) + a(x))\, u(x + y_k)^p + (b_0(x) + b(x))\, v(x + y_k)^p \\ &\qquad\qquad +2\,(\beta_0 + \beta(x))\, u(x + y_k)^{p/2}\, v(x + y_k)^{p/2}\big] dx} \\ &= \frac{\|u\|^2 + \|v\|^2 - 2\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (\kappa_0 + \kappa(x - y_k))\, uv\, dx}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \big[(a_0(x) + a(x - y_k))\, u^p + (b_0(x) + b(x - y_k))\, v^p \\ &\qquad\qquad +2\,(\beta_0 + \beta(x - y_k))\, u^{p/2}\, v^{p/2}\big] dx} \\ &= \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \big[a_0(x)\, u^p + b_0(x)\, v^p + 2\beta_0\, u^{p/2}\, v^{p/2}\big] dx - 2\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \kappa(x - y_k)\, uv\, dx}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \big[a_0(x)\, u^p + b_0(x)\, v^p + 2\beta_0\, u^{p/2}\, v^{p/2}\big] dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \big[a(x - y_k)\, u^p + b(x - y_k)\, v^p \\ &\qquad\qquad +2\beta(x - y_k)\, u^{p/2}\, v^{p/2}\big] dx}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $|y_k| \to \infty$, $t_k \to 1$ and hence $\Phi(u_k, v_k) \to c_0$, so $c \le c_0$. To see that the reverse inequality holds, for any $(u, v) \in \mathscr{N}$ such that $uv \ge 0$, let $t > 0$ be such that $(tu, tv) \in \mathscr{N}_0$, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} t^{p-2} &= \frac{\|u\|^2 + \|v\|^2 - 2\kappa_0 \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} uv\, dx}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \big[a_0(x)\, |u|^p + b_0(x)\, |v|^p + 2\beta_0\, |u|^{p/2}\, |v|^{p/2}\big] dx} \\ &= \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \big[(a_0(x) + a(x))\, |u|^p + (b_0(x) + b(x))\, |v|^p + 2\,(\beta_0 + \beta(x))\, |u|^{p/2}\, |v|^{p/2}\big] dx + 2\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \kappa(x)\, uv\, dx}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \big[a_0(x)\, |u|^p + b_0(x)\, |v|^p + 2\beta_0\, |u|^{p/2}\, |v|^{p/2}\big] dx} \end{aligned} \tag{7.1}$$

Since $\kappa(x), a(x), b(x), \beta(x) \le 0$ and $uv \ge 0$, $t \le 1$ and hence

$$c_0 \le \Phi_0(tu,tv) = t^2\left(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{p}\right)\left[\|u\|^2+\|v\|^2-2\kappa_0\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} uv\,dx\right] \le \left(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{p}\right)\left[\|u\|^2+\|v\|^2\right.$$

$$\left.-2\kappa_0\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} uv\,dx\right] \le \left(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{p}\right)\left[\|u\|^2+\|v\|^2-2\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}(\kappa_0+\kappa(x))\,uv\,dx\right] = \Phi(u,v)$$

by (2.4), so $c_0 \le c$. If $\Phi(u,v) = c$, then equality holds throughout and hence $t = 1$ and (u,v) is a ground state solution of system (3.1), so an argument similar to that in the proof of Lemma 3.1 shows that $uv > 0$. Then (7.1) implies that $\kappa(x), a(x), b(x), \beta(x) \equiv 0$, which is contrary to assumptions. □

By Lemma 7.1, system (1.1) has no solutions at the level c, so we look for a solution at a higher energy level using the notion of barycenter as in [3]. In view of Lemma 3.6, we only consider the case where $p = 4$ and a_0, b_0 are positive constants, so our system is

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + u = (a_0 + a(x))\,u^3 + (\beta_0+\beta(x))\,v^2u + (\kappa_0+\kappa(x))\,v & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N, \\ -\Delta v + v = (b_0 + b(x))\,v^3 + (\beta_0+\beta(x))\,u^2v + (\kappa_0+\kappa(x))\,u & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N, \end{cases} \tag{7.2}$$

where $N \le 3$, $\beta_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, $a, b, \beta, \kappa \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ go to zero as $|x| \to \infty$, and

$$a_0 + \inf_{x\in\mathbb{R}^N} a(x) > 0,\ b_0 + \inf_{x\in\mathbb{R}^N} b(x) > 0, 0 < \kappa_0 + \inf_{x\in\mathbb{R}^N}\kappa(x) \le \kappa_0 + \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^N}\kappa(x) < 1. \tag{7.3}$$

The associated energy functional is

$$\Phi(u,v) = \frac{1}{2}\left(\|u\|^2+\|v\|^2\right) - \frac{1}{4}\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}\left[(a_0+a(x))\,u^4 + (b_0+b(x))\,v^4\right]$$
$$-\frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}(\beta_0+\beta(x))\,u^2v^2 - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N}(\kappa_0+\kappa(x))\,uv, \quad (u,v)\in E.$$

For $u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$, let

$$\mu(u)(x) = \frac{1}{|B_1|}\int_{B_1(x)} |u(y)|\,dy$$

and note that $\mu(u)$ is a bounded continuous function on $\mathbb{R}^N$. Then set

$$\hat{u}(x) = \left[\mu(u)(x) - \frac{1}{2}\max\mu(u)\right]^+,$$

so that $\hat{u} \in C_0(\mathbb{R}^N)$. The barycenter of a pair $(u, v) \in E \setminus \{(0,0)\}$ was defined in [3] by

$$\xi(u,v) = \frac{1}{|\hat{u}|_1 + |\hat{v}|_1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} x\,(\hat{u}(x) + \hat{v}(x))\,dx$$

(see also [6]). Since $\hat{u}$ and $\hat{v}$ have compact supports, $\xi : E \setminus \{(0,0)\} \to \mathbb{R}^N$ is a well-defined continuous map. As noted in [3], it has the following properties:

1. If u and v are radial functions, then $\xi(u,v) = 0$.

2. For $t \neq 0$, $\xi(tu, tv) = \xi(u,v)$.

3. For all $y \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $\xi(u(\cdot + y), v(\cdot + y)) = \xi(u,v) - y$.

Set

$$\tilde{c} = \inf_{(u,v)\in\mathcal{N},\, \xi(u,v)=0} \Phi(u,v).$$

Clearly, $\tilde{c} \geq c$. As in [3], we have the following lemma.

Lemma 7.2. $\tilde{c} > c$.

Proof. Suppose $\tilde{c} = c$. Then there exists a sequence $(u_k, v_k) \in \mathcal{N}$ such that $\xi(u_k, v_k) = 0$ and $\Phi(u_k, v_k) \to c$. By Ekeland's variational principle (see [16]), there exists another sequence $(\tilde{u}_k, \tilde{v}_k) \in \mathcal{N}$ such that

1. $\Phi(\tilde{u}_k, \tilde{v}_k) \to c$,

2. $\Phi|'_{\mathcal{N}}(\tilde{u}_k, \tilde{v}_k) \to 0$,

3. $\|(\tilde{u}_k, \tilde{v}_k) - (u_k, v_k)\| \to 0$.

As in the proof of Lemma 3.1, $\Phi'(\tilde{u}_k, \tilde{v}_k) \to 0$. This together with the mean value theorem and (3) above imply that

$$\Phi'(u_k, v_k) \to 0 \tag{7.4}$$

since Φ'' maps bounded sets onto bounded sets.

Since $\kappa_0 + \sup \kappa(x) < 1$, it follows from (2.4) that (u_k, v_k) is bounded. We pass to the renamed subsequence provided by Theorem 4.1, and note that

$$(u_k, v_k) - \sum_n (U^{(n)}(\cdot - y_k^{(n)}), V^{(n)}(\cdot - y_k^{(n)})) \to 0 \text{ in } E \tag{7.5}$$

by (4.4), (7.4), and the continuity of the Sobolev imbedding. By Proposition 4.2,

$$\Phi(U^{(1)}, V^{(1)}) + \sum_{n\geq 2} \Phi_0(U^{(n)}, V^{(n)}) = c,$$

$(U^{(1)}, V^{(1)}) \in \mathscr{N} \cup \{(0,0)\}$, and $(U^{(n)}, V^{(n)}) \in \mathscr{N}_0 \cup \{(0,0)\}$ for $n \geq 2$. In view of Lemma 7.1, then $(U^{(1)}, V^{(1)})$ trivial and $(U^{(n)}, V^{(n)})$ is nontrivial for at most one $n \geq 2$. Since $\mathscr{N}$ is bounded away from the origin, then (7.5) implies that $(U^{(n)}, V^{(n)})$ is nontrivial for exactly one $n \geq 2$, say, for n_0, which then is a ground state solution of system (3.1). Then $(u_k, v_k) - (U^{(n_0)}(\cdot - y_k^{(n_0)}), V^{(n_0)}(\cdot - y_k^{(n_0)})) \to 0$ and hence $(u_k(\cdot + y_k^{(n_0)}), v_k(\cdot + y_k^{(n_0)})) \to (U^{(n_0)}, V^{(n_0)})$ after a translation, so

$$\xi(u_k(\cdot + y_k^{(n_0)}), v_k(\cdot + y_k^{(n_0)})) \to \xi(U^{(n_0)}, V^{(n_0)}) \tag{7.6}$$

by the continuity of the barycenter. However,

$$\xi(u_k(\cdot + y_k^{(n_0)}), v_k(\cdot + y_k^{(n_0)})) = \xi(u_k, v_k) - y_k^{(n_0)} = -y_k^{(n_0)}$$

and $|y_k^{(n_0)}| \to \infty$, contradicting (7.6). □

Let (u, v) be a radially symmetric positive ground state solution of system (3.1) and consider the continuous map

$$\Gamma : \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathscr{N}, \quad \Gamma(y) = (t_y\, u(\cdot - y), t_y\, v(\cdot - y)),$$

where $t_y > 0$ is such that $\Gamma(y) \in \mathscr{N}$. We have

$$\xi(\Gamma(y)) = \xi(u, v) + y = y \tag{7.7}$$

since u and v are radial functions. Moreover, as in the proof of Lemma 7.1,

$$t_y^2 = \frac{\|u\|^2 + \|v\|^2 - 2\displaystyle\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (\kappa_0 + \kappa(x+y))\, uv\, dx}{\displaystyle\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left[(a_0 + a(x+y))\, u^4 + (b_0 + b(x+y))\, v^4 + 2\,(\beta_0 + \beta(x+y))\, u^2 v^2\right] dx} \tag{7.8}$$

and

$$\Phi(\Gamma(y)) \to c_0 = c \quad \text{as } |y| \to \infty. \tag{7.9}$$

Lemma 7.3. *Assume that* $0 < \kappa_0 < 1$ *and one of the following conditions holds:*

(1) $\beta_0 \geq 3$*;*

(2) $1 \le \beta_0 \le 3$ *and* $w(0) \le \sqrt{\frac{2\kappa_0(1+\beta_0)}{(3-\beta_0)(1-\kappa_0)}}$, *where* w *is the unique positive solution of the scalar equation* (3.24)*;*

(3) $-1 < \beta_0 < 1$, $w(0) \le \sqrt{\frac{2\kappa_0(1+\beta_0)}{(3-\beta_0)(1-\kappa_0)}}$, *and*

- *if* $N = 1$, *then* κ_0 *or* $\beta_0 - 1$ *is sufficiently small,*
- *if* $N = 2, 3$, *then* $\beta_0, \kappa_0 > 0$ *are sufficiently small, or* $|\beta_0|$ *is sufficiently small and* κ_0 *is close to 1.*

Then c_0 *is an isolated critical level of* Φ_0.

Proof. We use an indirect argument. Suppose that there exists a sequence $(u_n, v_n) \in E$ such that *(i)* $\Phi_0'(u_n, v_n) = 0$; *(ii)* $\Phi_0(u_n, v_n) > c_0$; *(iii)* $\Phi_0(u_n, v_n) \to c_0$. As in Proposition 4.2, there exists $y_n \in \mathbb{R}^N$ such that $(\tilde{u}_n(x), \tilde{v}_n(x)) = (u_n(x-y_n), v_n(x-y_n))$ converges to some $(u, v) \in E$ strongly. Moreover, $\Phi_0'(u, v) = 0$ and $\Phi_0(u, v) = c_0$, i.e., $z = (u, v)$ is a ground state solution of (3.23). As in [3, Lemma 3.5], then $u, v > 0$ or $u, v < 0$. By Lemma 3.3, $z_1 = (\sqrt{\frac{1-\kappa_0}{1+\beta_0}} w(\sqrt{1-\kappa_0}x), \sqrt{\frac{1-\kappa_0}{1+\beta_0}} w(\sqrt{1-\kappa_0}x))$ is the unique positive solution. From this and the structure of the system (3.23) we infer that the solution of (3.23) with both components negative is also unique. Hence $z_2 = (-\sqrt{\frac{1-\kappa_0}{1+\beta_0}} w(\sqrt{1-\kappa_0}x), -\sqrt{\frac{1-\kappa_0}{1+\beta_0}} w(\sqrt{1-\kappa_0}x))$ is the unique negative solution of (3.23). In conclusion, we have $z = z_1$ or $z = z_2$. As in Lemma 3.6 and Remark 3.7, z_1 and z_2 are nondegenerate solutions of (3.23). Thus, $\Phi_0(u_n, v_n) = c_0$ by [3, Lemma 3.7], contradicting *(ii)*. □

Henceforth we assume the hypotheses of Lemma 7.3, so that c_0 is an isolated critical level of Φ_0. Let $d_0 = \inf\{d > c_0 : d \text{ is a critical level of } \Phi_0\}$ and set $\tilde{c}_0 = \min\{d_0, 2c_0\}$. Then $\tilde{c}_0 > c_0$ and we have the following lemma.

Lemma 7.4. Φ *satisfies the* $(\mathrm{PS})_d$ *condition for all* $d \in (c_0, \tilde{c}_0)$.

Proof. Let $d \in (c_0, \tilde{c}_0)$ and let $(u_k, v_k) \in E$ be a $(\mathrm{PS})_d$ sequence for Φ, i.e., $\Phi(u_k, v_k) \to d$ and $\Phi'(u_k, v_k) \to 0$. Since

$$\Phi(u_k, v_k) - \frac{1}{4}\Phi'(u_k, v_k)(u_k, v_k) = \frac{1}{4}\left(\|u_k\|^2 + \|v_k\|^2 - 2\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (\kappa_0 + \kappa(x))\, u_k v_k\right)$$

and $\kappa_0 + \sup \kappa(x) < 1$, it follows as in (2.4) that (u_k, v_k) is bounded. Passing to the renamed subsequence provided by Theorem 4.1 and utilizing Proposition 4.2,

$$\Phi(U^{(1)}, V^{(1)}) + \sum_{n \ge 2} \Phi_0(U^{(n)}, V^{(n)}) = d,$$

$(U^{(1)}, V^{(1)}) \in \mathscr{N} \cup \{(0,0)\}$, and $(U^{(n)}, V^{(n)}) \in \mathscr{N}_0 \cup \{(0,0)\}$ for $n \geq 2$. Since $c = c_0$ and $d < 2c_0$, then $(U^{(n)}, V^{(n)})$ is nontrivial for at most one $n \geq 1$. Since $d > 0$, then $(U^{(n)}, V^{(n)})$ is nontrivial for exactly one n, say, for n_0. Since $c_0 < d < d_0$ and Φ_0 has no critical levels in this interval, $n_0 = 1$. Then $(u_k, v_k) \to (U^{(1)}, V^{(1)})$ as in the proof of Lemma 7.2. □

Lemma 7.5. *If*

$$\frac{\left(1 + \frac{|\kappa|_\infty}{1-\kappa_0}\right)^2}{1 - \max\left\{\frac{|a|_\infty}{a_0}, \frac{|b|_\infty}{b_0}, \frac{|\beta|_\infty}{\beta_0}\right\}} < \frac{\tilde{c}_0}{c_0}, \tag{7.10}$$

then $\Phi(\Gamma(y)) < \tilde{c}_0$ *for all* $y \in \mathbb{R}^N$.

Proof. Since $\Gamma(y) \in \mathscr{N}$,

$$\Phi(\Gamma(y)) = \frac{t_y^2}{4}\left[\|u\|^2 + \|v\|^2 - 2\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (\kappa_0 + \kappa(x+y))\, uv\, dx\right]$$

by (2.4). Since the numerator in (7.8) is less than or equal to

$$\|u\|^2 + \|v\|^2 - 2\,(\kappa_0 - |\kappa|_\infty)\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} uv\, dx = \left(1 + \frac{|\kappa|_\infty}{1-\kappa_0}\right)\left[\|u\|^2 + \|v\|^2 - 2\kappa_0\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} uv\, dx\right]$$
$$- \frac{|\kappa|_\infty}{1-\kappa_0}\left[\|u\|^2 + \|v\|^2 - 2\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} uv\, dx\right] \leq 4c_0\left(1 + \frac{|\kappa|_\infty}{1-\kappa_0}\right)$$

and the denominator is greater than or equal to

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left[(a_0 - |a|_\infty)\, u^4 + (b_0 - |b|_\infty)\, v^4 + 2\,(\beta_0 - |\beta|_\infty)\, u^2 v^2\right] dx$$
$$\geq 4c_0\left(1 - \max\left\{\frac{|a|_\infty}{a_0}, \frac{|b|_\infty}{b_0}, \frac{|\beta|_\infty}{\beta_0}\right\}\right),$$

the conclusion follows from (7.10). □

The main result of this section is the following theorem.

Theorem 7.6. *Let* $a_0, b_0 > 0$, $0 < \kappa_0 < 1$, *and assume that* (7.3) *and the hypotheses of Lemma 7.3 are satisfied. If* $\kappa(x), a(x), b(x), \beta(x) \leq 0$, *with at least one of the inequalities strict on a set of positive measure, and* (7.10) *holds, then the system* (7.2) *has a nontrivial bound state solution.*

Proof. By Lemmas 7.1 and 7.2, and (7.9), there exists a constant $R > 0$ such that

$$c_0 < \max_{|y|=R} \Phi(\Gamma(y)) < \tilde{c}. \tag{7.11}$$

Let

$$Q = \Gamma(\overline{B_R(0)}), \qquad S = \{(u, v) \in \mathscr{N} : \xi(u, v) = 0\},$$

and note that $\partial Q \cap S = \emptyset$ by (7.7). We claim that ∂Q links S, i.e., $h(Q) \cap S \neq \emptyset$ for every map h in the family

$$\mathcal{H} = \{h \in C(Q, \mathscr{N}) : h|_{\partial Q} = id\}.$$

To see this, let $h \in \mathcal{H}$ and consider the continuous map $\varphi = \xi \circ h \circ \Gamma : \overline{B_R(0)} \to \mathbb{R}^N$. If $|y| = R$, then $\Gamma(y) \in \partial Q$ and hence $h(\Gamma(y)) = \Gamma(y)$, so $\varphi(y) = y$ by (7.7). By the Brouwer fixed point theorem, then there exists $y \in B_R(0)$ such that $\varphi(y) = 0$, i.e., $h(\Gamma(y)) \in S$.

We have

$$\inf_S \Phi = \tilde{c} > \max_{\partial Q} \Phi > c_0 \tag{7.12}$$

by (7.11). Set

$$d = \inf_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \max_{(u,v) \in h(Q)} \Phi(u, v).$$

Since ∂Q links S, $d \geq \tilde{c} > c_0$, and since $id \in \mathcal{H}$, $d < \tilde{c}_0$ by Lemma 7.5, so Φ satisfies the $(\mathrm{PS})_d$ condition by Lemma 7.4. So d is a critical value of Φ by a standard argument. □

Proof of Theorem 1.3. From Theorem 7.6, we know that the results of Theorem 1.3 hold. □

Acknowledgements: This work was completed while K. Perera was visiting the Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science at the Chinese Academy of Sciences, and he is grateful for the kind hospitality of the host institution. J. Wang was supported by Natural Science Foundation of China (No: 11571140) and Natural Science Foundation of Jiangsu Province (Nos: BK2012282, BK20150478). Z.-T. Zhang was supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (Nos: 11325107, 11271353, 11331010).

References

[1] A. Ambrosetti, E. Colorado, Standing waves of some coupled nonlinear Schrödinger equations, *Journal of the London Mathematical Society*, 75(1) (2007) 1-16.

[2] A. Ambrosetti,E. Colorado , D. Ruiz, Multi-bump solitons to linearly coupled systems of nonlinear Schrödinger equations, *Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations*, 30(1)(2007) 85-112.

[3] A. Ambrosetti, G. Cerami, and D. Ruiz. Solitons of linearly coupled systems of semilinear non-autonomous equations on $\mathbb{R}^n$. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 254(11):2816–2845, 2008.

[4] T. Bartsch, E. N. Dancer , Z. Q. Wang, A Liouville theorem, a-priori bounds, and bifurcating branches of positive solutions for a nonlinear elliptic system, *Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations*, 37(3-4)(2010) 345-361.

[5] J. Belmonte-Beitia, V. M. Pérez-Garca ,P. J. Torres, Solitary waves for linearly coupled nonlinear Schrödinger equations with inhomogeneous coefficients, *Journal of nonlinear science*, 19(4)(2009) 437-451.

[6] Giovanna Cerami and Donato Passaseo. The effect of concentrating potentials in some singularly perturbed problems. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 17(3):257–281, 2003.

[7] K. C. Chang. *Methods in nonlinear analysis*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2005.

[8] M. Cwikel, C. Tintarev, On interpolation of cocompact imbeddings, Revista Matematica Complutense 26 (2013), 33-55.

[9] E. N. Dancer and Juncheng Wei. Spike solutions in coupled nonlinear Schrödinger equations with attractive interaction. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 361(3):1189–1208, 2009.

[10] E. N. Dancer, J.C. Wei, T. Weth, A priori bounds versus multiple existence of positive solutions for a nonlinear Schrödinger system, *Ann. I. H. Poincaré-AN* 27(3) (2010), 953-969.

[11] E. N. Dancer, K.L. Wang, Z.T. Zhang, Uniform Hölder estimate for singularly perturbed parabolic systems of Bose-Einstein condensates and competing species, *J. Differ. Equ.*, 251(10) (2011) 2737-2769.

[12] E. N. Dancer , K.L. Wang, Z.T. Zhang, The limit equation for the Gross-Pitaevskii equations and S. Terracini's conjecture, *J. Funct. Anal.* 262(3) (2012) 1087-1131

[13] E. N. Dancer , K.L. Wang, Z.T. Zhang, Dynamics of strongly competing systems with many species, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 364(2) (2012) 961-1005

[14] E. N. Dancer , K.L. Wang, Z.T. Zhang, Addendum to "The limit equation for the Gross-Pitaevskii equations and S. Terracini's conjecture(J. Funct. Anal. 262 (3) (2012) 1087-1131)", *J. Funct. Anal.* 264(4) (2013) 1125-1129.

[15] B. Deconinck, P. G. Kevrekidis, H. E. Nistazakis, D.J. Frantzeskakis, Linearly coupled Bose-Einstein condensates: From Rabi oscillations and quasiperiodic solutions to oscillating domain walls and spiral waves, *Physical Review A*, 70(6) (2004) 063605.

[16] I. Ekeland. On the variational principle. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 47:324–353, 1974.

[17] K. Li and Z.T. Zhang. Existence of solutions for a schrödinger system with linear and nonlinear couplings. *Submitted*.

[18] B. Noris, H. Tavares , S. Terracini and G. Verzini,Uniform Hölder bounds for nonlinear Schrödinger systems with strong competition, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 63(3) (2010) 267-302.

[19] K. Tintarev, K.-H. Fieseler, Concentration compactness: functional-analytic grounds and applications, Imperial College Press, 2007.

[20] J. Wang and J.-P. Shi. Standing waves of a weakly coupled Schrödinger system with distinct potential functions. *J. Differential Equations*, 260 (2016)1830-1864.

[21] Rushun Tian, Zhitao Zhang, Existence and bifurcation of solutions for a double coupled system of Schrödinger equations, *Science China Mathematics*, 58(8)(2015), 1607-1620.

[22] H. Tavares, S. Terracini, Sign-changing solutions of competition-diffusion elliptic systems and optimal partition problems, *Ann. I. H. Poincaré-AN* 29 (2012) 279-300.

[23] Terracini S., Verzini G., Multipulse Phases in K-Mixtures of Bose-Einstein Condensates, *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 194 (2009) 717-741.

[24] J.-C. Wei and W. Yao. Uniqueness of positive solutions to some coupled nonlinear Schrödinger equations. *Commun. Pure Appl. Anal.*, 11(3):1003–1011, 2012.

[25] M. Willem. *Minimax theorems*. Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications, 24. Birkhäuser Boston Inc., Boston, MA, 1996.

[26] J. Busca and B. Sirakov. Symmetry results for semilinear elliptic systems in the whole space. *J. Differential Equations*, 163(1):41-56, 2000.

[27] B. Sirakov. Least energy solitary waves for a system of nonlinear Schrödinger equations in $\mathbb{R}^n$. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 271(1): 199-221, 2007.

[28] E. N. Dancer, J.-C. Wei, and T. Weth. A priori bounds versus multiple existence of positive solutions for a nonlinear Schrödinger system. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 27(3):953–969, 2010.

[29] N. Ikoma. Uniqueness of positive solutions for a nonlinear elliptic system. *NoDEA Nonlinear Differential Equations Appl.*, 16(5):555–567, 2009.